
APPENDIX.



APPENDIX

TO THE

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Army Bill and Philippine Policy.

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN F. SHAFROTH,
OF COLORADO.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, December 5, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 4300) to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States—

Mr. SHAFROTH said:

The pending bill authorizes the President to increase the standing Army of the United States from 26,800 to 100,000 men, and makes no provision for ever letting it decrease below 58,000.

It is admitted by all that the full 100,000 will be enlisted as soon as possible, and no one claims he can foresee when the Army will ever be reduced.

The only attempt to justify such a large increase in the permanent Army is the claim that a temporary emergency in the Philippines requires it. Even if the purpose were commendable, the bill should be framed to meet temporary conditions and not for a permanent establishment. A bill providing for a standing Army should be constructed with relation to the needs of the Government in times of peace, for that is the condition of our country nine-tenths of the time. We have always and will always rely upon the volunteers during wars, because experience has demonstrated that they make the best soldiers. Though not as well drilled, they enlist for a cause which inspires them to the most heroic acts of valor.

Without the condition in the Philippines the Administration can show no reason whatever for increasing the standing Army. The policy of the United States, notwithstanding the desire of the Administration, has not been definitely settled with respect to the archipelago, and until it is so settled legislation of a permanent character is premature. There is to be an argument before the Supreme Court of the United States on the 17th day of this month in a case, the decision of which will determine the question whether or not the Constitution follows the flag.

If that decision is that the inhabitants of the possessions of this Government are entitled to the privileges of the Constitution, then I can not believe that the American people will ever sanction the holding of the Philippine Islands.

If we are not going to retain them no one will contend that we need an army of 100,000 men. Consequently the passage of this measure should necessarily depend upon what policy the nation is going to pursue with respect to those islands, that is, whether the Administration's policy should be continued.

In my judgment it is one of the most momentous questions that has ever arisen in American politics. It goes to the very fundamental principles which underlie our form of government. It is the question as to whether the law of our being shall longer exist, whether we shall pursue the principles of a republic, or establish the doctrines of an empire.

I wish now to examine this question—

First, from the moral aspect: Is it right?

Second, from the legal aspect: Is it legal?

Third, from the practical aspect: Is it expedient?

I. MORAL ASPECT—IS IT RIGHT.

About two and a half years ago the United States found a people near its southeastern border on the island of Cuba struggling for freedom, for liberty, and for independence. The insurrection, caused by the tyranny and oppression of Spain, had existed for a

long period of time. We had sympathized with the Cuban patriots for a number of years, but finding that sympathy was of no avail, we determined to put a stop to the tyranny inflicted, and declared war against Spain. In the declaration of war we stated that the people of Cuba "are, and of right should be, free and independent."

No holier war was ever waged by one nation against another. It was a war against tyranny and oppression, for liberty, for freedom, and for independence. It was an unselfish war upon the part of the United States, for in that same declaration we stated that it was not the intention of this Government to appropriate or acquire any part of the island of Cuba, and no one dreamed of taking any of her other possessions. On the 1st day of May, 1898, in order to bring victory to our cause, Admiral Dewey sailed into Manila Harbor and completely destroyed the fleet of Montejó. He found in the Philippines, that the people of those islands were in arms against the Spanish Government, to prevent the same cruelty and tyranny which had been inflicted for years in Cuba. Thirty thousand insurgents were organized against the Spanish forces. They had been fighting just as the Cubans—for freedom, for liberty, and for independence, the only difference being that the Philippine people had been fighting for a much longer period of time. Instead of a strife of ten years, there had been for more than three hundred years almost a continual war in the Philippine Islands against the Spanish Government.

Admiral Dewey immediately saw the necessity of asking the cooperation and assistance of the insurgent soldiers. He invited Aguinaldo, their former leader, to take command of those forces, and caused him to be brought in an American vessel to the Philippine Islands. The insurgent troops were supplied with arms and ammunition by the American officers, and they immediately began a most aggressive warfare against the Spanish. They captured and conquered town after town where Spanish troops were garrisoned. They took 7,000 prisoners and drove from the interior of the islands into the city of Manila every Spaniard to be found. They captured the second largest city of the Philippine Islands—namely, the city of Iloilo—without the assistance of a single American soldier.

General Anderson, the general in command of the American Army, on the 4th day of July, 1898, wrote a letter to the commander of the Philippine forces, in which he said:

I desire to have the most amicable relations with you and to have you and your people cooperate with us in military operations against the Spanish forces.

And again, on July 23, 1898, General Anderson, in a letter to Aguinaldo, used the following language:

When I came here three weeks ago I requested your excellency to give what assistance you could to procure means of transportation for the American Army, as it was to fight in the cause of your people.

Soon thereafter Aguinaldo issued a proclamation to the Filipinos, in which the following language was used:

Die rather than be ungrateful to our American liberators. Where you see the American flag flying assemble in numbers. They are our redeemers.

A large number of Spanish prisoners were delivered by the American forces to the Filipinos, to be kept as prisoners of war. The Philippine troops and the American soldiers surrounded the city of Manila.

On the day of the surrender of Manila 15½ miles of the surrounding line was occupied by the Filipinos and 600 yards by the American troops. It is a well-recognized rule in military affairs that when two armies are besieging a third the surrender of the besieged must always be made to the force having the greater numbers.

In the meantime a government had been formed and organized by the Philippine people. They issued a declaration of independence, and on the 18th day of June, 1898, adopted a constitution. The government immediately began to exercise its functions, proceeding with the establishment of a judicial and a school system and the collection of taxes for the maintenance of the government.

These were the conditions and these the services rendered by the Filipinos at the time of the signing of the treaty of peace at Paris. While the peace commissioners were sitting, the Philippine government sent a deputation to Paris for the purpose of being heard as to its right to the islands. They knocked at the door of the commission, but knocked in vain. After the signing of the treaty of peace they came to Washington and tried to submit to the President of the United States the reasons why the United States was in honor bound to recognize the independence of the Philippine people, but the door of the White House was closed, and they knocked in vain.

OUR PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT.

Mr. Chairman, previous to 1776 there was practically but one form of government existing throughout the world. It recognized the doctrine that all powers of government were vested in one man—the king or sovereign; that he granted to the people just such rights, such liberties, and such privileges as he deemed proper that they should have. It was a theory of government that recognized that God Almighty gave powers of government to the king, who exercised them as he deemed best. It was called “the divine right of kings.” The rights and privileges which were given to the people were generally granted only upon compulsion.

When tyranny and oppression existed to such an extent that it became intolerable, the people at times arose and compelled the sovereign to grant them rights and privileges. The right of trial by jury and the right to the writ of habeas corpus were obtained from the king only at the point of the sword. These privileges and rights when once granted were respected, and such governments were termed limited monarchies, but the original source of authority was by all recognized to be in the sovereign.

In 1776 the Revolutionary patriots contended that the doctrine of “the divine right of kings” was false; that powers of government were not vested in one man, but that all powers of government ascended from the people instead of descending from the king.

They issued a proclamation called the Declaration of Independence, and in that instrument they declared that all men are created equal before the law; that they are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed.

The war of 1776 is called the war of the Revolution, because it promulgated a form of government which completely revolutionized the ideas of government that existed previous to that time.

I take it that every American citizen believes in the fundamental principles of the Declaration of Independence, and therefore it seems strange that we have to ask Americans, Is it right for the Administration to violate the fundamental principles of that declaration? Is it right to treat men as unequal before the law? Is it right to forcibly annex a people without their consent? Is it right to subjugate a people who are struggling for freedom, for liberty, and for independence? The citing of instances where it is claimed this Government has violated these principles, even if parallel (which they are not), would not justify another violation. One wrong can never justify another.

The national Republican convention met in the city of Philadelphia last June for the purpose of declaring the principles of that great political party. They met at a place which should have made the heart of every delegate pulsate with sentiments of liberty, of freedom, and of independence. It was there that the immortal Declaration of Independence was first promulgated to the world. It was there that Liberty Bell pealed forth its sweet tones to an oppressed people. Yet, notwithstanding the hallowed memory of these patriots, the delegates to that convention forgot the principles that are enunciated in that immortal instrument and declared as to the Philippines that they would give to them “the largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties.” To be determined by whom? To be determined by us. That to-day is the policy of the present Administration.

Ah, Mr. Chairman, what a great departure is that language from the language of liberty, of freedom, and of independence. How near does it resemble the language of kings and of emperors. I want to arraign that declaration, not in the feeble words that I am capable of uttering, but in the language of the man who, above all others, is most competent to speak for the Republican party. I mean that greatest of American commoners, Abraham Lincoln. Here is the statement that he made relative to almost the identical language contained in the Republican platform. He said:

These arguments that are made that the inferior races are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done as their condition will allow—what are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of kingscraft were of this class; that they always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. Turn it whatever way you will, whether it come from the mouth of a king, an excuse for enslaving the people of the country, or from the mouth of men of one race for enslaving the men of another, it is all the same old serpent.

And again, Mr. Lincoln, referring to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, used the following language:

The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society, and yet they are denied and evaded with no small show of success. One dashing call them “glittering generalities;” another bluntly calls them “self-evident lies;” others insidiously argue that they apply to “superior races.”

These expressions, differing in form, are identical in object and effect—the supplanting the principles of free government and restoring those of class, caste, and legitimacy. They would delight a convocation of crowned heads plotting against the people. They are the vanguard, the miners and sappers, of returning despotism. We must repulse them or they will subjugate us. This is a world of compensation, and he who would be no slave must consent to have no slave. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not themselves, and, under a just God, can not long retain it.

All honor to Jefferson, to the man who, in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people, had the coolness, forecast, and capacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document an abstract truth applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there that to-day, and in all coming days, it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling-block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression.

Abraham Lincoln, in a speech delivered on September 11, 1858, again referred to our reliance against a resumption of tyranny in these words:

Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere. Destroy this spirit, and you have planted the seeds of despotism around your own door.

What a terrible arraignment of the resolution of the Republican national convention upon the Philippine question do these declarations of Abraham Lincoln constitute!

President McKinley, in his message to Congress on April 11, 1898, said:

I speak not of forcible annexation, for that can not be thought of; that by our code of morals would be criminal aggression.

And again, in a speech at the New England dinner given at New York in 1890, he used the following language:

Human rights and constitutional privileges must not be forgotten in the race for wealth and commercial supremacy. The government by the people must be by the people, and not a few of the people. It must rest upon the free consent of the governed. Power, it must be remembered, which is secured by oppression or usurpation or by any form of injustice is soon dethroned.

Yet, notwithstanding these declarations, the Republican party, through the Administration, is now waging a war for forcible annexation of islands whose people never did us any harm, but who welcomed us as their redeemers; who aided and assisted us in every way in defeating Spain and in driving the Spaniards from the Philippine Islands.

I say this is a war not of the Government but of the Administration, for although the power to declare war is vested by the Constitution of the United States in Congress alone, yet Congress has passed no resolution declaring war against the Filipinos.

Is it possible that anyone who believes in the doctrine of republics should even have to be asked the question as to whether the policy of this Administration as to the Philippines is right?

Sir, we knew that they were fighting for independence when we asked their cooperation, and every moral obligation required the Government after receiving the benefit of their assistance to aid them in their independence.

We have had an instance in the history of our own Government that can make us clearly see the injustice of the action of this Administration in the Philippines. During the war of the Revolution France sent to this country General Lafayette, with several thousand brave French soldiers. They knew we were fighting for liberty, for freedom, and for independence. They fought side by side with the forces of Washington and the other generals of the Revolutionary war, just as the Filipinos fought side by side with the American troops in the archipelago.

What would you have thought of the moral turpitude of France if, after the surrender of the British at Yorktown, she had sent a commission to Great Britain and negotiated a treaty with that Empire by which, in consideration of \$30,000,000, there should be ceded to France the thirteen colonies of America?

There is not a man within the sound of my voice but what would have condemned that action in the most severe terms. What would Americans have done under those circumstances? They would have said that we fought England with courage and determination, but we will fight France with heroism and desperation.

“Do unto others as you would that others should do unto you.” When we apply to ourselves the action which this Administration is authorizing in the Philippines, there is no man so blind but what can see the injustice of such conduct.

IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT NOW IN THE PHILIPPINES.

The Republicans tell us that there is no such thing as imperialism involved in this policy; that the charge of imperialism is false; that it is a “bogey man” with which to scare the people, and they defy anybody to define imperialism.

Imperialism is government without the consent of the governed. Our forefathers said that taxation without representation

was tyranny, and I believe it is as much tyranny to-day as it was in the days of the Revolutionary war.

In order to govern the Philippine people, who were not in insurrection, but who, it was claimed, desired annexation with our country, a commission was appointed by the President without any authority from Congress to supplant the military rule theretofore existing and establish civil government.

I hold in my hand a dispatch from Manila, which no man can hear without knowing that imperial government is now being imposed in the Philippine Islands. Though he may not agree as to my definition of imperialism, yet he must recognize, after hearing this dispatch, that according to any definition of imperialism which he may frame it exists to-day in those islands. All the dispatches that are sent from Manila first go through the hands of an American officer, and whenever anything is contained therein that is of detriment to the Administration he strikes it out at his will. It is called "censoring the dispatches." Hence you can rely upon the fact that this dispatch from Manila tells nothing more against the Administration than is absolutely true. This is the dispatch:

MANILA, August 5, 1900.

On September 1 the commission, headed by Judge Taft, will become the legislative body of the Philippines, with power to take and appropriate insular moneys, then establish judicial and educational systems and to make and pass laws.

No money will be permitted to be drawn from the insular funds except by authorization of the committee. Judge Taft and his colleagues will also exercise certain executive functions. For instance, they will appoint judges, officials in the educational department, and officers of municipalities.

This commission was appointed by President McKinley, a foreign ruler to the Philippine people. It consists of five men who are not even of the same race with them; men who never saw the Philippine Islands before the Spanish war; men who did not then and do not now speak the language of the Filipinos; men who do not know the wants or needs of these people. How would we like to be ruled by a commission of that kind?

And yet that commission goes to these islands, assumes control of the government, and becomes the legislative body thereof, with power to take and appropriate, as they deem proper, the moneys raised by taxation of the Philippine people. Not only that, but they will appoint all the judges, officials in the educational department, and officials of the municipalities. In other words, these five gentlemen appointed from Washington will pass all the laws, spend all the money, and appoint all the officers of the islands.

If you search the colonial governments of the empires of the world, it will be difficult indeed to find one which imposes more arbitrary power than this form of government for the Philippines.

King George III never imposed such government upon the thirteen colonies. They always had the right to elect a legislature from among the people, and absolute freedom of speech was allowed in these legislative bodies.

It was in the Virginia house of burgesses, if you remember, that Patrick Henry arraigned King George III himself, and closed with the ever memorable sentence, "As for me, give me liberty or give me death."

A new form of caption in legislative bills is now being used for the first time in the history of our Government, in the introduction and passage of measures through this commission of the Philippines. Every bill that is considered by this commission commences with these words, "By the authority of the President of the United States, be it enacted by the Philippine Commission."

Is it possible that there is a man within the sound of my voice who does not know, beyond the peradventure of a doubt, that the government now being imposed in the Philippine Islands is imperial?

England prides herself on her great Empire, but she has no such arbitrary form of government in a single one of her numerous colonies. And is it possible that there is a man who believes in the principles of the Declaration of Independence; who believes that the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed; who believes that all men are created equal and are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, can for a moment believe that the arbitrary action of this Administration with relation to the Philippines is right?

The golden rule is the best test of justice. Ask yourself what you would think if you were in their place.

Abraham Lincoln well said:

No man is good enough to govern another man without that other man's consent. When the white man governs himself, that is self-government; but when he governs himself and also another man, that is more than self-government—that is despotism.

WILL CONGRESS GIVE JUST GOVERNMENT TO THE PHILIPPINES?

It is said that in time Congress will give a just government to the Philippine people, that there is no danger of imperialism from an American Congress. Ah, Mr. Chairman, the same thing was said as to Porto Rico. If there ever was a people who should have been generously treated it was the inhabitants of that little island. They had welcomed our invading army with flowers and greet-

ings of joy. Our generals had told them that they should receive the privileges and blessings of our Constitution. By annexation we had deprived them of the open markets of Spain. Yet when it came to enacting laws for that island, Congress, guided by its own selfish interests, imposed a tax upon their goods shipped to this country, notwithstanding the Constitution declares that no duty can be imposed upon goods transported from one part of the United States to another. No annexationist will admit that Congress is going to extend the Constitution to the Philippine Islands. Can an advocate of the principles of a republic believe that Congress can give just government to a people, and yet deny to them the principles of its being and the privileges of its Constitution?

No nation can govern a people of another race in distant lands without having conflicting interests continually arise, which will be affected by the laws imposed. Nations, as well as individuals, are selfish. They will generally favor their own country, and thereby do a wrong to the people so governed. It is for that reason that self-government is the most satisfactory government known to man.

It may be contended that the imposition of duties is simply a matter of taxation, and therefore not serious. But, when we remember that our forefathers fought because of the imposition of a stamp tax, we can not close our eyes to the fact that the power of taxation can be made the most oppressive engine of destruction, devastation, and desolation a country can know.

The denial of the right of trial by jury would affect only about one man in five hundred, and the denial of the right to the writ of habeas corpus would affect only about one in a thousand; but the imposition of taxes affects every man, woman, and child in the land. Discrimination in duties often destroys industries and produces poverty and distress, and it is said the power of taxation can be made the instrument of annihilation.

FLAG ARGUMENT APPEAL TO SENTIMENT NOT REASON.

What answer do the Republicans give to these arguments as to the moral aspect of the question? They answer by saying, "Never pull down the American flag." That is an appeal to our sentiment and not to our reason. They make that appeal because they know that the American people love the American flag. They love that flag because it has always been the emblem of freedom, of liberty, and of independence.

Do they not know that the American flag was pulled down from the City of Mexico; from the embattlements of Chapultepec, and from the heights of Quebec; from the northwest boundary of Maine, and even from the western shore of England itself, where it was planted by John Paul Jones?

Is it possible that a flag should be compelled to float when it would be to the detriment of the nation to retain it there? The American flag should be hauled down from every place where it never should have been planted.

Last summer we unfurled the flag upon the walls of Peking and we hauled it down less than six weeks thereafter. Is there an American in this broad land who believes that the flag should have remained there forever?

It is also true that in nearly every one of those instances the blood of our soldiers had consecrated the soil of those countries, and to-day at the City of Mexico lie buried some of the bravest soldiers of the war of 1847.

WHO ARE THE PATRIOTS?

Do you not recognize that the flag argument is purely an appeal to sentiment? Does not everyone know that it would be criminal to keep a flag at any place where we violate the fundamental principles of our Government, or where it would be detrimental to the interests of our nation?

The Republican party, in its flag argument, attempts to make out that everyone who believes in taking down the flag and not upholding the Administration in this war is unpatriotic, and that we should not even indulge in criticism of the Administration's policy with respect thereto. Is it possible that when a policy is being pursued which in our judgment is fraught with so much disaster to our institutions and future welfare, it is unpatriotic to protest? As long as we believe that the policy is so fatal to our country it would be unpatriotic not to protest.

Who are the patriots upon this question? The position we take is not out of love for the Filipinos. I never knew a Filipino in my life, nor have I a friend in the Philippine Islands, and I doubt very much whether anyone has within the sound of my voice.

It is not for the Filipinos that we want to give them their liberty, their freedom, and their independence, but it is because of the effect that a policy of conquest would have upon the citizens of our own country and the welfare of our nation.

No man can justify forcible annexation unless he resorts to the argument that "might is right;" and when he does that, he blunts his own sense of equity and justice. Abraham Lincoln has well said that—

Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not themselves, and under a just God can not long retain it.

Who are the patriots? Are they those whose policy will compel the trampling under foot of the sacred principles of the Declaration of Independence or are they those who want to retain the government of a republic? Are they those who want to change the form of our Government, who want to govern distant islands without the consent of the governed, or are they those who believe in liberty, freedom, and independence for all mankind?

Ah, Mr. Chairman, when one analyzes this question, he can come to no other conclusion than that if there are unpatriotic people in this country, they are those who want to overthrow the principles under which this Government has existed and flourished for more than a century and start the nation upon a career of colonial empire.

VALUE NO ANSWER TO MORAL QUESTION.

What other answers do they make to the moral aspect of this question? Oh, they say the islands are fabulously rich in minerals and soil, and they must be ours. Do you not recognize in that declaration an appeal to your cupidity, to your greed, to your rapacity? Is it possible that we should determine a question of morals by the gain that we can make? That is the argument of the highwayman. That is the argument of everyone who wants something that does not belong to him, and it is the argument of every land-grabbing empire in the world. The Bible has well said, "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" and I say, What doth it profit a nation if it gain the whole world and lose its sense of right and justice?

I therefore contend that from the moral aspect the policy of this Administration as to the Philippine Islands is wrong.

II. LEGAL ASPECT—IS IT LEGAL?

I wish now to examine this question as to its legal aspect.

1. It is a principle of international law that no nation can transfer title to territory over which it has not control and possession.

The reason for this rule is very clear. International law receives the sanction of governments in order to prevent difficulties, conflicts, and wars among nations. You can readily see that if it were legal for a nation to transfer title to territory of which it has not possession, it would produce innumerable conflicts and wars between nations. After a people had won their independence it would only be necessary for the mother country to cede the land so liberated to some greater power, which would crush the new government. If title to territory is to be recognized as belonging to a nation after it has lost possession and sovereignty, for what period of time can it still claim title. There is no statute of limitations known to international law.

The King of England retained as part of his title the words "Duke of Normandy and King of France" down to the beginning of the nineteenth century, but the cession by the King of England of the dukedom of Normandy or the Kingdom of France would not have been recognized by a single nation in the world.

At the time the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain was signed not a single foot of territory of the entire archipelago was in possession of Spain. The Filipinos had driven every Spaniard from the islands into the city of Manila and had captured 7,000 prisoners, and the city of Manila had been taken by the cooperation of the Filipinos and the American forces. So that at the time Spain ceded the islands to the United States, according to the principles of international law, she had no more title to those islands outside of the city of Manila than you have to the Kingdom of Spain. Therefore this Administration, in attempting to assert title in violation of the principles of international law, is wrong from a legal aspect.

2. There is another principle of international law which is well established, and that is that no ally can enrich himself at the expense of another.

In the testimony of Commander Bradford, of the United States Navy, before the Paris peace commission the following question and answer succinctly states the situation:

Mr. FRYE. I would like to ask just one more question in that line. Suppose the United States, in the progress of that war, found the leader of the present Philippine rebellion an exile from his country in Hongkong, and sent for him and brought him to the islands in an American ship, and then furnished him 4,000 or 5,000 stands of arms and allowed him to purchase as many more stands of arms in Hongkong, and accepted his aid in conquering Luzon, what kind of a nation in the eyes of the world would we appear to be to surrender Aguinaldo and his insurgents to Spain to be dealt with as they pleased?

Answer. We became responsible for everything he has done. He is our ally, and we are bound to protect him. (Sen. Doc. No. 62, p. 489.)

When General Anderson wrote to the leader of the insurgents that he desired the cooperation of the Filipino insurgents with the American troops against the Spanish forces, and when he assured them in another letter that "the American Army was to fight in the cause of your people," and when Admiral Dewey declared, "I have given him (Aguinaldo) to understand that I consider the insurgents as friends, being opposed to a common enemy," a moral alliance was formed as clearly as it is possible to form an alliance between forces. And when the Filipino insurgents actually rendered the assistance in aiding the Americans in conquering Spain, in taking Spanish prisoners and Spanish strongholds, with the

Americans well knowing that they were fighting for their liberty and independence, it constituted an alliance that should be as sacred as any treaty stipulation that was ever signed and ratified. And yet, in view of these facts, should we enrich the Government at the expense of our allies by annexing the Philippine Archipelago?

What does that mean? It means a betrayal of an ally. It is said that even savage tribes will never betray an ally. Should this, the greatest Government on earth, the nation highest in civilization and in morals, take advantage of the assistance and cooperation of our allies and make them the subjects of our Government? No, never.

3. There is another principle of international law to which I wish to call your attention. It is that on the cession of territory the inhabitants of the ceded territory have the right to choose whether their allegiance shall remain to the government existing at the time of the cession or whether it shall be given to the new possessor. It is contended that the insurgents are rebels to our Government. No one can be a rebel to a government who does not owe allegiance to that government; and can anyone indicate when and where the Filipinos raised their hands and swore to support the Constitution of the United States?

They had the right to choose whether they should remain citizens of the government existing at the time of the formation of the treaty or whether they should declare their allegiance to the United States. And it is as legitimate to criticize the Administration as to its action in the Philippines as it is to criticize the same Administration as to its conduct with respect to the strike in the Cœur d'Alene district, in the State of Idaho.

This is the legal aspect of the case, and I maintain that the Administration has violated the fundamental principles of international law in its conduct as to the people of the Philippine Islands.

III. PRACTICAL ASPECT—IS IT EXPEDIENT?

I wish now to examine the question from the practical aspect. Is it expedient for the United States to hold the Philippine Islands? And in the discussion of this phase of the question I wish to examine it, first, from the political standpoint; second, from the commercial standpoint, and, third, from the military standpoint.

POLITICAL STANDPOINT.

1. From the political standpoint, I mean as such action will affect the great political policies of our Government. We are bound to treat the Filipinos either as subjects or as citizens. The rights and privileges of the Constitution either extend to them or they do not. No one contends that certain parts of it apply and other parts do not. The Constitution as an entirety either follows the flag or it does not.

What political difficulties do we get into if we treat the Philippine people as subjects? We thereby give them cause for complaint and discontent. They will say to us that the Declaration of Independence, which the Supreme Court of this nation has declared to be the spirit of this Government, states that all men are created equal, and are entitled, as an inalienable right, to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that from the consent of the governed all just powers of government are derived, and they will thereupon ask, "Why are we not treated as equal, when the spirit of your Government says that we are?" "Why are we not entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness when it is guaranteed, and why is not our consent asked in the exercise of the just powers of government?" There can be no answer to these questions that can possibly satisfy them, or would satisfy any of us if we were in their place, and, consequently, treating them as subjects gives cause for discontent, for violence, and for insurrection.

There has been considerable comment to the effect that the Philippine insurgents get their encouragement to resist from the declarations made in the Senate and other places relative to their treatment.

Ah, Mr. Chairman, the Filipinos get their encouragement from our own Declaration of Independence, for it is there said that—

Whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

As they are fighting for their independence, the treatment of them as subjects will forever be a cause of discontent, discord, violence, and insurrection.

If we are to govern the islands under such conditions, it will require thousands and thousands of troops, which will make the expenses of governing them far out of proportion to any benefit or return we will get by reason of their annexation.

What political difficulties do we get into if we treat them as citizens? When we say that the Constitution extends to the Philippine Islands, we say that the products of the cheap labor of the Philippine Islands can be brought to this country to compete freely with the products of the labor of the American citizens, and that the Filipino can come to the country to which he owes allegiance and can himself here compete with the labor of our

own people. We know that the American laborer will never stand the competition of the cheap labor of the Orient, and they should not be compelled to compete with men who can live on 3 cents a day, and whose daily wage is between 20 and 30 cents. We have had an exhibition of the spirit of the American workman upon this question. The permission of this Government to let Chinese immigrate to our shores produced among our own workmen discontent and violence, and if restrictive legislation had not speedily followed it would have resulted in revolution itself.

So that, when we treat the Filipinos as citizens and let them compete with our own workmen, we do our own laborers a wrong, and give them cause for discontent and for violence. Thereby we simply transfer the storm center of discontent from the Philippine Islands, where it will exist if we treat them as subjects, to our own country, where it will exist if we treat them as citizens. Nor can we ever solve this problem during annexation, for we attempt to do so on principles which are against human nature. The little brown men love independence as well as we, and the only solution is in treating them as we do the Cubans.

The acquiring and holding of islands in the Orient waives our right to insist upon the application of the Monroe doctrine. That doctrine was promulgated for the purpose of preventing the colonization of territory on this side of the Atlantic by nations of the Eastern Hemisphere. It was for the purpose of preventing the establishment of monarchies upon this side of the waters. Its reciprocal implied promise was that we should not interfere with any of the affairs of the Eastern Hemisphere. When we acquire territory in the Orient, we are in justice bound to give to European nations the privilege of acquiring territory on this continent.

The Monroe doctrine, in my judgment, has done more to the upbuilding of this country than any other one policy which it has pursued, and it has done more for liberty and freedom and the establishment of republican institutions than any policy the United States could have followed. I for one am not willing to abandon or jeopardize the wholesome effect of that great policy.

The history of the world shows that race problems have been the most difficult of all to solve. While people have been willing to acknowledge the equality of men of their own race, they have generally in practice denied it as to other races. While man will suffer the bitterest enemy of his own race to exercise authority over him, he will not quietly permit men of other races to do the same.

Race wars will surely ensue, and they are the most cruel and unrelenting of all conflicts. Why jeopardize the peace and quiet of a contented people, and invite the violation of the laws of our Government, by adding to our country a people of a tropical clime, who are not homogeneous with us in either manners, customs, or character?

From the political standpoint, therefore, it seems to me foolish for the United States to attempt to hold the Philippine Islands.

COMMERCIAL STANDPOINT.

2. I wish now to examine this question from the commercial standpoint. Is it wise for the United States to keep the Philippine Islands?

I hold in my hand the last statement issued by the Insular Bureau of the War Department of the United States, which contains the imports to the Philippine Islands from the various nations of the world for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900. I regard this statement as the most powerful and potent argument against the annexation of the Philippine Islands that has ever been made. It truly tells a most wonderful tale.

It shows the total imports, including gold and silver coins, to those islands for that period were \$36,152,597. The imports by the leading countries are as follows: From China, \$6,446,680; United Kingdom, \$3,941,422; Spain, \$2,092,530; United States, \$1,656,469; British East Indies, \$1,998,680.

It will be seen from that statement that although the flag of our country has been floating over the ports of the archipelago, yet the United States has acquired not one-twentieth of the imports to the islands.

It will be further noted that the total imports from the United States were \$1,656,469, a large part of which consists of goods demanded and purchased by our own soldiers. It is asserted that the average exporter does exceedingly well if, after the payment of transportation charges and insurance, he makes a profit of 10 per cent upon his goods. That profit is more than the average made.

Ten per cent of the imports from the United States to Manila is simply \$165,646. That is the total profit in an entire year which is made to commerce by the holding of the Philippine Islands. What is the cost of maintaining that commerce?

We have at the present time in the Philippine Islands 65,000 American soldiers. It has been the estimate of the War Department ever since the close of the civil war that the average cost of a soldier, including his food, uniforms, equipment, and ammunition in times of peace is \$1,000 for each soldier. It would be much more for

the soldiers in the Philippines, as transportation is much farther and supplies much dearer, but counting it at that average, 1,000 times 65,000 soldiers means \$65,000,000 which the United States is paying in order to maintain a commerce in which there is a profit of \$165,000 a year.

Who gets the profit? The United States Government? Oh, no. The profit is to the exporter and manufacturer of goods. Who pays the cost of \$65,000,000 a year? The Government. And who pays the Government? The people of the United States.

How long will the American people stand the expenditure of \$65,000,000 a year out of moneys collected from the people for the purpose of putting into the pockets of a few of the exporters and manufacturers of goods a profit of only \$165,000 a year?

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield just for one question?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. HULL. Do I understand the gentleman from Colorado to say that we are keeping soldiers there to maintain commerce, or is it not to maintain order there?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will come to that in a minute. It is probably to maintain your authority there at the present time; but you will find that even according to the President's message you propose to keep a large number of men there an indefinite length of time. I do not believe you will ever be able to withdraw a single soldier from the Philippine Islands.

Divide the \$65,000,000 by the three hundred and sixty-five days in the year and you will find that the Government is paying each day, out of moneys collected from the people, more money than the total profit in an entire year is to the manufacturer and exporter of goods.

To a business man how preposterous does this proposition appear. How long would he be willing to spend \$365 of his money for the purpose of putting into the pocket of some one else a profit of \$1, and yet that is exactly what is being done in the Philippine Islands.

The cost of imperialism is far greater than I have stated. It is shown in the appropriations by Congress for this year as contrasted with the appropriations for the year prior to the Spanish war. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, they were \$469,499,010. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, the appropriations amounted to \$710,150,862, a difference of nearly \$250,000,000, and in addition contracts for the Navy were authorized to the amount of \$52,334,374. But greater than all cost is the loss in life of thousands of the flower and youth of our land, which, even if we have peace, from tropical diseases must continue as long as we hold the islands.

It is said, however, that the war will soon be over and it will not be necessary to have so many troops there. Ah, Mr. Chairman, the war will not soon be over. The same spirit of liberty and independence which burned so intensely in the breasts of our forefathers also burns in the heart of the "little brown man," and it will be years and years before the insurrection has been totally suppressed.

I have heard of no estimate, even if we conquer the Filipinos, but by which it will require 30,000 troops to patrol the islands, and 30,000 troops means at least \$30,000,000 a year, and that means an expenditure of at least \$180 for each \$1 of profit to the exporter.

The chances are that instead of the soldiers being less than 65,000 in number they will be increased to 100,000 before the war is over, and that will mean more than \$100,000,000 expenditure per annum.

It is also said that the commerce of the Philippine Islands will increase. Yes, it will increase; it may double, it may quadruple, it may increase even tenfold, and yet it could not do that except after a long series of years, as no nation ever has so greatly increased its commerce in a generation; but even if it were to increase tenfold and the islands were in a state of pacification with only 30,000 troops to patrol it, nevertheless there would be an expenditure of \$18 of the people's money in order to maintain a commerce in which there would be a profit of only \$1 to the American exporter.

So, no matter from what standpoint we look at it, the holding of the Philippines will continually be a financial loss to the Government of the United States. We have taken hold of a red-hot poker, and the quicker we let it go the less of a burn we will receive.

But this little statement tells another mighty tale. If you notice, it says the imports from Spain were \$2,092,530. You have heard of the claim that trade follows the flag, and yet this little document demonstrates that the Philippine people bought from Spain—hated Spain, the Government with which they had been at war for three hundred years—more goods than they bought from the country whose flag now floats over Manila.

It demonstrates that trade does not follow the flag, but does follow the price list; that the Filipinos, like the Americans, will buy where they can buy cheapest and sell where they can sell dearest.

The theory that we need the Philippine Islands for the purpose

of extending our trade to China is the most chimerical dream that was ever fancied. What manufacturer would ship goods to Manila, a port 600 miles from China, unload them, and then re-ship them to points in that Empire. Could he compete with wholesale dealers and manufacturers at Hongkong or Shanghai? The mere statement of the proposition is conclusive of its truth.

The Chinese Government has granted a concession to the foreign powers to erect business houses and factories in a certain district containing several square miles at Shanghai. The entire government of that district, including imposition of taxes, is conferred upon the foreigners. Although the district is inhabited by 200,000 Chinese, they have no voice whatever in the municipal government thereof. That concession is worth more to our manufacturers and exporters than a hundred Manilas. Its location being at the entrance to the Yangtze Valley, which contains the richest lands of Asia, constitutes indeed the open door of our commerce for the Chinese Empire. It is the most economical distributing point that can be designated, and is the most available place from which to acquire the trade of the Orient.

It seems to me, therefore, that from the commercial standpoint it is the height of folly for this Government to hold the Philippine Islands.

MILITARY STANDPOINT.

3. From the military standpoint I mean, does the annexation of the Philippine Islands strengthen or weaken our nation?

It is the universal opinion of men skilled in the science of government that consolidarity of territory is the most invulnerable form of possession. Is it wise for us to exchange concentration for diffusion?

If we hold the Philippine Islands we will place targets 7,000 miles from our shores for the guns of every hostile power. Nations always assault each other at the weakest points. We recently had a war with Spain. We did not attack that country on her home territory. If we had it would have required ten times the men and ten times the ships to have accomplished the same result. We attacked Spain at her weakest points—in her outlying possessions—in the islands of the Philippines and in the island of Cuba. We brought the war speedily to a successful issue.

If we annex the Philippines, the first difficulty that we have with a foreign nation will make those islands the point of attack.

Lord Macaulay has eloquently denied the military value of colonies in the following language:

There are some who assert that from a military and political point of view the West Indies are of great importance to this country. This is a common but a monstrous misrepresentation. We venture to say that colonial empire has been one of the greatest curses of modern Europe. What nation has it ever strengthened? What nation has it ever enriched? What have been its fruits? Wars of frequent occurrence and immense cost, fettered trade, lavish expenditure, clashing jurisdiction, corruption in governments, and indigence among the people.

In order to overcome the weakening effect of retaining in our possession islands 7,000 miles from our shore, it will be necessary to inaugurate great changes in our governmental policy. It will be necessary first to have a navy two or three times as large as that which is amply sufficient to protect the shores of our own territory. The building and maintaining of a navy requires the expenditure of millions and millions of dollars, which must be paid for by the Government. The maintenance of such a navy requires thousands and thousands of marines, which cost millions and millions of dollars annually, all of which must be paid for by the people.

As Dewey surprised the fleet of Montejó in Manila Harbor, it demonstrates the necessity of any people holding the Philippine Islands being prepared against surprises, and in order to prevent such attacks it will be necessary to keep a large part of our Navy in Asiatic waters and to have on the islands themselves a large standing army. That large standing army will cost annually millions of dollars to maintain, and all of it must be paid from taxes collected from our own people. It seems to me, therefore, that from a military standpoint the acquisition of the Philippines is weakening instead of strengthening to our nation.

In conclusion, I wish to say that in my judgment the gravest and most serious problems are involved in the Philippine policy. May it be ultimately determined in the interest of the preservation of the great principles of our glorious Republic.

I have attempted to show that the policy of annexing and holding the Philippine Islands is wrong—first, from the moral aspect; second, from the legal aspect, and, third, from the practical aspect; that political problems are bound to arise on the annexation of these islands that can never be solved except by treating the Filipinos as we treat the Cubans. Any other attempted solution is against human nature, and therefore can not be effective. From the commercial standpoint I have shown that it must be a financial loss to our Government; and from a military standpoint that it is weakening rather than strengthening to our nation.

The departure from the fundamental principles of our Government are far-reaching in their consequences. We can not deny to

men the right of self-government without in time it affecting our own people. It was truly said that the Republic could not endure half slave and half free, and I believe it can not endure half republic and half empire.

Such a condition produces two schools of politics, one believing in the policies of an empire and the other in those of a republic; one believing in the right of some men to govern, and the other in the equality and rights of man. An irreconcilable conflict begins and continues for the supremacy of their respective doctrines, just as the slave power fought for the extension of slavery in the Territories.

One must ultimately triumph. Republics are formed only after revolution; the change to the empire is slow and gradual. One of the saddest things in history is that whenever these schools of politics have met the final result has been the triumph of imperial doctrines. Should we not profit by the experience of history?

This Army bill is one of the first measures made necessary by the policy of colonial empire. Other measures must be presented by which you will be compelled to vote either for the upholding of the principles of republican institutions or for the establishment of the policy of an imperial government. I know not what course you may pursue, but as for me, I want to say that I am for the Republic forever and for the empire never.

Army Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES R. WILLIAMS,

OF ILLINOIS.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, December 6, 1900.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 4300) to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States—

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This bill was reported to the House on Tuesday and taken up for consideration on Wednesday. Therefore members who are not on the Committee on Military Affairs have had very little opportunity to study the provisions of this measure and the report thereon. As the law under which our present Army is organized does not expire till next July, it seems to me there is no occasion for such undue rush in the passage of this bill.

A proposition of so much importance to the people and one which makes such radical and dangerous changes in the military establishment of this country deserves more deliberate consideration at the hands of Congress. During the short time I have before the committee I can do but little more than emphasize my sincere opposition to the passage of this bill, and express my surprise that even a Republican would support a proposition so un-American in principle and so full of threats and dangers to the time-honored policy of this Republic.

This bill proposes to increase the standing Army of the United States to about 100,000 men, at an annual cost to the people of from one hundred to one hundred and twenty-five million dollars, and this large and expensive standing Army is to be maintained in time of peace as well as in time of war. In fact, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, who has charge of this bill, was frank enough to admit in this debate that this large standing Army of 100,000 men is not intended for war, but for peace, and he says we will still depend on the volunteer soldier for military service in time of war.

This large standing army is merely to serve as a police force in time of peace, and to come out occasionally on dress parade to advertise to the world that we are indeed a world-power, and all this military splendor in time of peace is not to cost the taxpayers over one hundred and twenty-five millions a year. Now, Mr. Chairman, I can understand that if we are to pursue the policy of an empire and govern people by force, then we need a large standing army to execute our despotic purposes; but if we are to continue a republic, as assured by Republican speakers in the late campaign, then, sir, there is no occasion to tax our people for all this useless and dangerous military glory. A large standing army belongs to an empire, but has no place in a republic.

Under a government like ours, where the people rule, the people may always be relied upon to defend the people's rights. I believe in the volunteer soldier for the army of a republic. He loves to fight for liberty and hates to fight against it. We have always depended upon his patriotism, courage, and efficiency in the past, and can surely rest our hopes and purposes upon his strong arm in the future. Upon every page of our military history the volunteer soldier has written the splendid achievements

of his patriotic valor. As a Representative upon this floor I would rather tax the American people to pay a liberal pension to the volunteer soldier who served his country in time of war than tax the people to pay a large standing army to serve the country in time of peace. Can any gentleman on the other side of this Chamber explain why it is that we need nearly 75,000 more soldiers in our standing Army to-day than we required two, three, or five years ago?

If he answers that they are necessary on account of the war in the Philippine Islands, my reply is that we were repeatedly assured by Republican orators in the late campaign that the war was almost over there, and the reelection of Mr. McKinley would end it in less than sixty days. In fact, military gentlemen were brought back from those islands and paraded in their uniforms over the country to assure the people of my district and others that there was but a very small per cent of the Filipinos in rebellion, encouraged by the utterances of Mr. Bryan and other Democrats, and in case of Mr. McKinley's reelection hostilities would cease in a few weeks. Can it be possible that these Republican statesmen and military heroes were all mistaken in their glittering prophecies? Why, even the President, in his recent message to Congress, not having entirely recovered from the deceit practiced by the Republicans in the late campaign, still insisted that a very small per cent of the Filipinos are in insurrection.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if it is true, as claimed by many Republicans, that nine-tenths of the Filipinos are friendly to the policy of the Administration, then surely they ought to be able to protect themselves against the other one-tenth without sending a single American soldier there to aid them.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Can the gentleman explain why it is that the Philippians have not answered Paul's letter? [Laughter.]

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. I am afraid that I shall have to refer that question to our President, who is engaged in the work of "benevolent assimilation," or St. Mark, his chief adviser.

But when the President sufficiently emerges from the Republican dreams and prophecies of the recent election he candidly admits that he still needs forty-five thousand of these hundred thousand soldiers to complete his policy of criminal aggression in the Philippine Islands. And these 45,000 American soldiers are to be kept in that hotbed of disease and death, at an annual expense to our people of about \$75,000,000, not to benefit our country or our people, but to gratify the selfish greed which seems to control this part of the Administration.

But, Mr. Chairman, the President says in his message that these 45,000 men will be needed in the Philippine Islands only temporarily. Then why do you include them in a permanent standing army of 100,000 men to be continued in time of peace?

Why do you not bring in a bill providing a temporary force to meet this emergency which you claim is only temporary? Ah, Mr. Chairman, this large standing Army means something more than to furnish soldiers in the Philippines. It means a very radical and dangerous departure from the whole history of our Government, and no one regrets more than myself to see such a serious innovation upon the long-established, wise, and peaceful policy of this nation.

I sincerely fear it means more to the future of this Republic than many of us now realize. I am afraid it will do more to destroy than to defend the liberties of our people. If it follows the experience and teachings of other nations in this regard, it will bring us more loss than gain, more trouble than pleasure, more despotism than liberty, more darkness than sunshine. One of the most objectionable features of this bill is that provision which gives to the President the unwarranted and dangerous power to increase our Regular Army about 40,000 men whenever he sees fit to do so without the approval of Congress. This is a power which under our form of government rightfully belongs to the representatives of the people. This is too great a responsibility to place in the hands of any one man.

While such a power might be safe in the hands of such a President as Washington, it might become a weapon of great despotism in the hands of those whose ambition might excel their patriotism. It is certainly a move toward centralization at which the American people may well take warning.

Mr. Chairman, the great expense of a large standing army in time of peace is by no means its worst feature. Its tendency has always been to intimidate the citizen in the peaceful exercise of his civil rights, and finally undermine and endanger the very existence of self-government. It is always more dangerous in the hands of an ambitious ruler than a volunteer army.

But it is insisted by the friends of this bill that a hundred thousand men is not a large standing army for the United States when compared with the standing armies of European countries. It must be remembered that America has been so well fortified by nature with a great ocean on either side that it does not require for its defense a large standing army like Germany or other countries bounded on all sides by hostile governments. Besides, our people have no inclination to follow European countries in their

bloody history of war and conquest. We have a well-organized militia in almost every State, whose services the Federal Government has a right to command whenever an emergency arises.

And experience has demonstrated that it takes a very short time to equip a volunteer army whenever an occasion calls for it. I have no doubt but the President could raise a volunteer army of a million men in less than sixty days to defend the rights of our Government or the liberties of our people. Self-government cultivates a love of country and a patriotic interest in the affairs of state and creates a responsibility upon the citizen which the true American has always been quick to discern and ready to meet, and this patriotic concern for the welfare of our country is always more intense among our citizens on the approach of war than in time of peace; and it requires only the tap of the drum to enthuse the great body of our patriotic people for a ready march to battle and to victory. With such a government and such a people we have no occasion, in time of peace, to maintain in idleness a large standing army at such a heavy expense to the taxpayers of our Government.

It surely indicates that we are drifting away from the republican principles of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln into the military customs and dangers of European monarchies. The bill provides that, while the Army may be reduced to about 60,000, the number of commissioned officers shall remain the same, and that we shall continue on the pay roll as many commissioned officers for an army of 60,000 as was required for an army of 100,000. This is certainly a very objectionable piece of extravagance. But I do not know as it deserves very serious consideration, for it is not at all probable that our Army will ever be reduced. In fact it is more likely to be increased hereafter. You will find it an evil which will surely feed upon itself. With its many desirable offices it is likely to exert such an influence upon future Congresses as to control legislation to meet its growing ambition.

The larger we make our standing Army the more we advance the military over the civil authority of our Government. I prefer to live under a government where the civilian with his ballot, engaged in the faithful discharge of his peaceful duties, is considered just as patriotic and potent as the soldier with his musket. I repeat my surprise that a bill so full of evil promises for the future of our Government should be permitted to go through this House with such indifferent consideration. I have simply endeavored, in the short time allowed me, to call the attention of the House and the country to the general features of this bill, to show, so far as I have been able, the great dangers which it carries to the civil rights of our people, to the true Americanism of our Government, and to the general welfare of our country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Grant Bill.

SPEECH OF

HON. SAMUEL S. BARNEY,
OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 7, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 3717) to make oleomargarine and other imitation dairy products subject to the laws of the State or Territory into which they are transported, and to change the tax on oleomargarine.

Mr. BARNEY said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I took occasion during the first session of this Congress, and while the Alaskan bill was under discussion, to make some remarks upon the bill now under consideration. My remarks at this time will therefore necessarily be something of a repetition of what I then said.

The power of Congress to impose a tax upon oleomargarine colored in imitation of butter is unquestioned; hence the only question is as to the propriety and justice of such a tax. It is claimed that the effect of this legislation will be to crush out and ruin the industry of manufacturing oleomargarine made in imitation of butter, and for that reason that the bill ought not to become a law; and some have even claimed that it is unconstitutional for that reason.

The latter position is clearly wrong, for when the right to impose the tax at all is conceded, it will not be within the power of the courts to say to what extent it shall be exercised or when the limit of prohibition begins. The public welfare may demand the imposition of a tax prohibitory in its effect, and when it does, Congress has always freely exercised such power. It was done in the tax on State-bank circulation, on filled cheese, and adulterated flour.

The evidence introduced upon the hearings when this bill was before the Committee on Agriculture during the last session of this Congress clearly shows that the oleomargarine industry as

conducted at the present time is a fraud upon the public. Such being the case, how can it be said that a law is either unconstitutional or unjust which imposes a tax the incidental effect of which is to defend the public from a fraud and a counterfeit?

Upon this point the language of the court in the case of *Plumley vs. Massachusetts* (155 U. S., 461) is particularly applicable. Justice Harlan, in delivering the opinion, said:

And yet it is supposed the owners of a compound which has been put in a condition to cheat the public into believing it is a particular article of food in daily use and eagerly sought for by people in every condition of life are protected by the Constitution in making a sale of it against the will of the States in which it is offered for sale because of the circumstance that it is in an original package and has become a subject of ordinary traffic. We are unwilling to accept this view. We are of the opinion that it is within the power of a State to exclude from its markets any compound manufactured in another State which has been artificially colored or adulterated so as to cause it to look like an article of food in general use and the sale of which may, by reason of such coloration or adulteration, cheat the general public into purchasing that which they may not intend to buy.

The Constitution of the United States does not secure to anyone the privilege of defrauding the public. The deception against which the statute of Massachusetts is aimed is an offense against society. The States are as competent to protect their people against such offenses or wrongs as they are to protect them against crimes or wrongs of more serious character, and this protection may be given without violating any right secured by the National Constitution and without infringing the authority of the General Government. A State enactment forbidding the sale of deceitful imitations of articles of food in general use among the people does not abridge any privilege secured to citizens of the United States, nor in any just sense interfere with the freedom of commerce among the several States.

Why is the manufacture of oleomargarine a fraud? Because it is made and sold in the market for that which it is not, butter. The advertisements of its manufacturers all show that it is colored for the purpose, and the only purpose, of making the purchaser from the retailer believe that he is buying and eating butter. It goes into the market and upon the table of the consumer under false pretenses, claiming to be butter when it is nothing but a conglomeration of soap grease and oleo oil.

It is claimed by those who oppose this measure that oleomargarine is a better article of food than very much of the butter which is sold in the market.

That may be true, and yet it is no justification for this fraud. Bad butter may be a poor article of food, but it at least has the quality of being honest. It travels upon its own merits—or demerits—and deceives no one. If oleomargarine is such a superior article, why does it sneak into the market under disguise? Why does it dishonestly assume the color and appearance of that which it is not, and an inferior article at that? This brings me to a discussion of some things which have been said in opposition to this measure and which I believe are a misrepresentation of the motives of the promoters of this law. It is said in the report of the minority, and has been repeatedly said in this debate, that the object of this measure is to totally destroy the business of manufacturing oleomargarine. That is not the object, and neither will it be the result.

It only seeks to drive from the market that portion of oleomargarine which is colored and sold in imitation of butter. It only seeks to drive out of the market that part of this oleomargarine business which is a counterfeit and a fraud, or if it remains it must pay a tax commensurate with its fraudulent profits.

The dairymen of this country and the consumers of this country do not object, and they have no right to object, to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine if placed upon the market and sold without deception—that is, uncolored to imitate butter. Let it go into the market for just what it is and be sold upon its own merits and no one will have a right to complain or will complain.

In the report of the minority the impression is sought to be conveyed that W. D. Hoard, ex-governor of Wisconsin and president of the National Dairy Union, desires and expects by this measure to destroy the business of manufacturing oleomargarine, uncolored as well as colored. That such is not the case will be seen from his statement before the committee as printed in the hearings, for he says:

The hoped-for effect of the legislation asked of Congress is not to destroy the oleomargarine industry, but to force it over onto its own ground; to compel it to be made in its own guise and color. Is there anything unjust or unreasonable about this?

With a tax of 10 cents a pound on the counterfeit substitute, we believe the temptation for unjust profits, deceptive sale, dishonorable and dangerous conspiring against law, and fraudulent competition with an honest industry will be greatly modified.

An isolated extract is also given in the minority report from the statement made before the committee by Mr. Adams, pure-food commissioner for the State of Wisconsin, to show that his expectation was the same, viz, to destroy the oleomargarine industry, honest as well as dishonest. That that is not true is shown by this letter, which I have received from him and which he wrote when his attention was called to that part of the report:

THE RALEIGH,
Washington, D. C., December 8, 1900.

DEAR SIR: In the report of the minority of the Committee on Agriculture upon the Grout bill I am quoted as having said in my testimony before the committee, March 7, 1900, "There is no use beating about the bush in this matter. We want to pass this law and drive the oleomargarine manufacturers out of the business."

The statement is absolutely incorrect. I made no such declaration. I did say that the purpose of the Grout bill was to stop the coloring of oleomar-

garine in imitation of butter and to destroy that portion of the oleomargarine business which depended for its success upon the deception of the public. I have never, at any time or place, thought or said that the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, when not a counterfeit of butter, should be prohibited.

Respectfully, yours,

Hon. S. S. BARNEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

H. C. ADAMS.

It has been said in this debate that the coloring of pure butter by the dairyman is upon the same footing and equally fraudulent as the coloring of oleomargarine in imitation of butter. The incorrectness and even utter absurdity of such an argument hardly needs refutation. Oleomargarine is colored to cheat the purchaser and consumer into believing that he is buying pure butter, while butter is colored to suit his taste and is not intended to deceive him and does not deceive him as to the kind of article he is purchasing.

Pure butter is not even shaded in color by the manufacturer to deceive the public as to the time when it was made. There is no June butter in the market at this season of the year, or if it was it would not command as high a price as butter made last week. Winter butter, therefore, is sometimes colored, not for the purpose of making anyone believe that it is June butter, for that would depreciate its value, but because some people desire butter of a higher color than others. Woolen cloth is colored all shades of the rainbow, not for the purpose of deceiving anyone as to the material of which it is made, but because tastes differ in the selection of material for clothing. There is no more deception in the coloring of pure butter in the one case than there is in the coloring of wool in the other.

I am heartily in favor of the passage of this measure because, first, it is in the interest of pure food; second, because it is in the interest of the consumer, who has a right to know what he is purchasing and eating, and hence can buy it for what it is reasonably worth, and third, because it is a protection to the great dairying interests of this country against fraud and dishonest competition.

It is claimed by the friends of oleomargarine that this measure will deprive the poorer classes of the privilege of buying a cheap and nutritious article of food, and hence benefit the farmer at the expense of other classes. There is no foundation whatever for such a claim, because the natural and necessary effect of it will be to benefit the consumer of oleomargarine and the dairyman alike. It will injure no one but the dishonest manufacturers and dealers who are engaged in this fraud, and they ought to be injured and driven from the business.

The evidence shows that oleomargarine can be made for less than 8 cents per pound, and yet it is sold by retailers for 25 cents per pound and more, because the purchaser believes he is buying butter.

Let the bill become a law and oleomargarine will be compelled to go into the trade uncolored and for just what it is, and, as a result, can be bought for less than one-half what it costs now.

I say, then, that this bill is not only in the interests of the manufacturers of pure butter, but is equally in the interests of all who wish to use oleomargarine and to purchase it for what it is and for what it is honestly worth. For my part, I wish to see Congress go to the fullest extent of its taxing power for the suppression of fraud in any business, and particularly in the manufacture of what the public eats and drinks.

At the present time there are men engaged in the manufacture of honest—that is, uncolored—oleomargarine, and no one seeks to interfere with them.

In several cities in my own State these manufacturers of uncolored oleomargarine are putting their product upon the market and are selling it for a little more than one-half the price of the colored and fraudulent product. That fact proves that the passage of this bill will benefit the consumers of oleomargarine equally with the dairyman.

It will relieve the latter from dishonest and fraudulent opposition, and the former from dishonest and exorbitant profits.

It has been urged that this is improper class legislation; that is, that it is a measure for the benefit of one class to the detriment of another.

On the contrary, I say it is legislation designed to prevent one class from fraudulently obtaining undue advantage over another; legislation to prohibit the dishonest oleomargarine manufacturer from cheating the consumer directly and the dairyman indirectly.

The millions of dairymen in this country who are interested in this bill are scarcely heard, because of their scattered and necessarily unorganized forces. The other millions of consumers who are interested in pure food and honest prices are not heard, partly for the same reason and partly because they hardly realize the fraud which is being perpetrated upon them.

This is a battle of the honest butter producer and the honest consumer on the one hand against a gigantic combination of grease producers, who by fraud and dishonesty seek to rob both.

Let this bill pass and become a law and it will only benefit those who ought to be benefited and injure those who ought to be injured.

Army Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH B. CROWLEY,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, December 6, 1900,

On the bill (S. 4300) to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States.

Mr. CROWLEY said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The present strength of the Army is 100,000 men—65,000 Regulars and 35,000 Volunteers. We are advised by the War Department that there is need of haste in passing this bill, as by the 30th of June next our Army will be reduced to the minimum, and it takes some time to get a new army recruited and in the field for action. We know there is necessity for some legislation in regard to reorganizing the Army this session, but I am opposed to passing this bill as it now stands. There are some obnoxious features in the bill; a number of its provisions I can not indorse. My strongest objection is that it provides for a permanent military establishment which is to continue in time of peace as well as war.

Another objection is that it takes the power which rightfully belongs to Congress and vests it solely in the President to increase the Army from 58,000 to 100,000 at his pleasure. This is a dangerous and unwarranted authority to give any one man.

We ought to consider this bill as though we were working on a peace basis, and 58,000 would then be as great an army as we would need. I do not believe in making the Philippine emergency an excuse for fastening this standing army on us permanently. If an emergency exists at this time it should be dealt with as a case for legislation within itself. It does not come properly under this head at all. If we have an emergency, let us provide, as we have always done, with volunteers, and when the time of their service has expired let them return to their homes and pursue their peaceful avocations. I am unalterably opposed to putting an emergency provision in this bill intended to provide a permanent standing army. It admits on its face the fact that it would be possible to get along with 58,000 men.

This bill does not pretend that it is an emergency to strengthen the Executive to carry on the war in the Philippine Islands, as half the people in the United States right now regard it, but it is a bill introduced to fasten a standing army on us forever, no matter what our condition hereafter may become.

It is the duty of Congress to declare war and say what our standing Army shall be. This bill is not the production of this legislative body, but is the product of the Secretary of War and the President.

President McKinley in his message says:

There are assuring indications that the Philippine insurgents are coming to acknowledge the authority of the United States.

If this is the true state of affairs, why does he want an army of 100,000 men? Does he expect to go to war in the near future? We are at peace with the whole world, excepting Aguinaldo, and if we are to credit our President's message we will soon have him caught once again.

It is within the power of Congress to give the Executive all the soldiers necessary to maintain the authority of the United States in the Philippines and still not depart from the principles underlying our free Government. I am willing to give the Commander in Chief of the Army every man necessary to put down a rebellion against the established authority of the Government wherever found and vote every dollar necessary toward carrying it out. This country has never yet waged a war when there was a lack of brave men ready to fight. In 1898 our Government was called upon to meet an emergency which required the speedy raising of a large volunteer force. Our young men answered the call cheerfully and enthusiastically, and we had more volunteers than we could accept the service of. These men were brave and intelligent and capable of being made into the finest soldiers in the world. We as a nation have been opposed to a large standing army. It is not necessary for us to hold a large body of idle men in readiness to do our fighting. It has ever been our policy to have a small regular army and keep its standard as high as possible, and trust to the great mass of patriotic people to fight the battles of this country. I believe it is a wise policy. We should continue, as we have always done, to devote the energies of our people to the development of our resources. When conditions arise that we must put a large volunteer force into the field on short notice, let it be done in such a way as will bring the least burden upon the people and the least interference to those engaged in peaceful pursuits, and at the same time give us the best mili-

tary establishment possible for the amount of money and energy invested.

Now, we do not desire, in this country, to copy too much the systems of the armies of Europe. Quoting Representative McCall of Massachusetts: When we compare our standing Army with those of Europe we are very careful not to compare the relative costs. The French army costs \$125,000,000 a year and the German army \$130,000,000 a year. These figures include pensions and fortifications. If this bill passes, the War Department will ask for \$113,000,000.

There is another cost not included in these figures, which is a necessary incident to the Army and as much a part of the cost as the pay of the soldier—that is the pension system. We are appropriating for that purpose \$145,000,000 a year. Our total charges, therefore, for military purposes are \$258,000,000 per year (leaving out fortifications and ordnance), an amount greater than the joint military expenses of France and Germany.

The army of Germany works like a machine, and no doubt the Germans think it invincible. But it is this system of militarism that drives more Germans to the United States as an asylum than any one thing else. We do not want nor expect to sacrifice years out of the lives of our young men teaching them to be soldiers. What we desire is to allow our young men to be free to follow ordinary business avocations, and leave them to compete in the various pursuits whereby the energy and intelligence of our people may be encouraged and developed.

To meet any military necessity that may arise it is necessary to spread military knowledge as far as possible without interfering in the pursuits of our citizens. The organization and perfection of our State militia and National Guard is a step in that direction.

We have a fine Military Academy at Westpoint for training officers. I am in favor of enlarging it so as to accommodate a sufficient number of cadets to officer any large volunteer army we may be called upon at any time to raise in order to maintain peace within our own borders or repel invaders. An officer should not only be a man of general education, but should be master of the technical and practical business of handling large bodies of men according to the most improved military methods. It is just as necessary for an Army officer to have a professional education as it is for a doctor, a lawyer, or a minister of God's word. An Army officer has the lives of his men in hand, and the complaint about mismanagement at our camps during the late Spanish war was not due to the quality of our men, but was largely due to a lack of proper knowledge and technical training on the part of some of the officers. I will say nothing here as to how they obtained their appointment, as that has become a piece of notorious political history.

Not one word would I say to detract from the honor and the glory that belongs to the great men who have risen to high places in all our wars in spite of their lack of professional education. Some men are born leaders.

Whenever it is necessary to protect the United States, give me the old volunteer. There never has been a battle fought in this country in which the victory was not achieved by our volunteer forces. I am not afraid of Illinois volunteers failing to defend the Stars and Stripes. They have been tried and never found wanting. I have no criticism to make of our present standing Army. It is good to a certain extent, but it can be made better, and that is what I want. Keep it small, but raise it to the highest standard.

Excellent as our military school at Westpoint is, no man claims it is yet perfect. It should be kept in touch with the people all over the United States. It should be essentially democratic. Boys are appointed from the different Congressional districts, and they take their places in the institution without regard to previous condition or social standing. The son of the millionaire must comply with the regulations exactly the same as the son of the farmer or laboring man of any description. Each one at the door of Westpoint enters equal, and from thence on depends upon his own individual merit. I oppose too many appointments given over to the President, on the ground of starting an aristocratic military class, whereby Westpoint could be used to take care of the "sons of the somebodies." Indeed, I favor that all appointments in Congressional districts should even be made by competitive examinations, where your son and my son and the son of the most lowly laborer can compete for one of the highest honors of our land. This is democratic. This is the original intention of the fine military school furnished by our Government.

I approve of enlarging the school and of giving Congressional districts a greater number of cadets, to be selected by competitive examinations held by nonpartisan boards.

The general effect on a large volunteer force of men having among them thoroughly educated officers can not be overestimated. The whole organization is bound to absorb, almost unconsciously, many ideas of military tactics from them. This question is one of the greatest importance to us right now.

I am going to vote for this substitute bill providing a temporary

army of 100,000 men. I believe that we need an army of 100,000 men until the insurrection in the Philippines is put down, but I want to adhere to the principles that have always controlled us in these matters. We were told during the recent campaign that as soon as McKinley should be reelected the Filipinos would hasten to embrace peace, but such does not seem to be the case, the President's message to the contrary. We are now informed officially that it is absolutely necessary to reorganize the Army with 100,000 men, as they will be needed before the Philippines are subjugated.

While I am opposed to the policy of the Philippine war, you gentlemen on the other side of this House have adopted it and are responsible for the results. Now, in order to save life and end the suffering of our boys in the Philippines I am willing to vote any number of men in order that this war may be brought to a speedy termination. But is this the purpose of your intention when you ask us to vote 100,000 men? If so, why not accept them temporarily? Or is it because we have been told that we have become a world power that we want them as an evidence of our pomp and splendor?

Senator HOAR has truly said:

They tell us that we have become so great and powerful that the world needs us, but what the world most needs is not the touch of our power, but the blessing of our example.

The Grout Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. T. ZENOR,

OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 7, 1900.

On the Bill (H. R. 3717) to make oleomargarine and other imitation dairy products subject to the laws of the State or Territory into which they are transported and to change the tax on oleomargarine.

Mr. ZENOR said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not propose to enter into any elaborate discussion of the many incidental questions to which this measure has given rise in the course of debate. What I most desire is to emphasize the very great importance of this bill to the producers and consumers of dairy products of our country. The magnitude of this industry in my State, and especially in my district, may not equal that of the great States of Pennsylvania, New York, Iowa, Wisconsin, and many other States of the Union, nor of that of many other Congressional districts represented by other gentlemen upon this floor, but is of sufficient magnitude and importance to justify me in occupying a few moments in submitting a few remarks in support of this bill.

The Committee on Agriculture, after long and continued sittings, full hearing, and carefully weighing all the evidence for and against, favorably reported it. There is a maxim as old as government itself to the effect that when the farmer is prosperous the country is prosperous, and the experience of generations has proven the truth of this. The conditions that bring about decay in the great agricultural industries of a country also mark the decline of the prosperity of the country itself. There can be no enduring prosperity unless it has for its basic support the general welfare of the great body of men who till the soil. As a means designed to promote this interest, I favor the passage of this measure, known as H. R. 3717, the Grout bill.

I not only believe it will do much to promote the legitimate interests of the farmers and dairymen, but that it will accomplish this without injuring any other legitimate industry engaged in the production of articles of pure food which may wish to enter the market without fraud and deception, notwithstanding the contention of those opposed to it. This bill, if passed, will in a large measure accomplish two purposes. It will safeguard the interests of the producers of butter, and will also protect the consumer from deception in the nature and quality of the food he buys. If he wishes to buy butter, he can do so without the risk of getting some imitation substitute. If he wishes to buy oleomargarine, it enables him to purchase this article, and to obtain either commodity he chooses at the proper price of each.

This bill has been widely misrepresented. It could not, however, be expected that a measure antagonized by such a combination of common interests as is represented by more than twenty-six oleomargarine and butterine manufactories, which are deriving such immense profits from their business, conducted in the main in defiance of law and under cover of fraud, would receive fair treatment. In saying this I do not wish to be understood as asserting, however, that all the opposition to the bill comes from those directly interested in the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. There is opposition urged by many members of the House upon

higher grounds than any merely pecuniary interest—opposition based upon what is claimed to be an objection to a fundamental principle involved and violated in the provisions of the bill. I do not care to discuss this objection, as this has already been done by able and distinguished gentlemen and this phase of the question fully presented.

What I do wish to say, however, is this: That ever since this bill was presented to the House, and even while it was pending before the committee, the oleomargarine people have been industriously engaged in an effort to create a prejudice and opposition to the bill in certain quarters by seeking to array the cattle industry, the hog industry, and the cotton industry against the bill as a measure that would materially affect and curtail the market for certain products of these different industries. They further insist that the underlying purpose of its authors and friends is to invoke the taxing power of the Government to crush and drive out of business one industry for the benefit of another, to levy a tax of 10 cents per pound upon colored oleomargarine in imitation of butter, and thereby make it impossible to pursue that industry further. In this view I do not concur, nor do I agree with the contention that it is either the design or purpose of the bill to crush out the business of the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, nor that this would be the effect of its operation.

The bill simply provides that oleomargarine shall be sold as oleomargarine, and not as butter, and that consumers seeking butter shall not be imposed upon. The bill merely seeks to place each industry on its own basis and let each stand or fall by its own merits. What injustice is there in this proposition? What more fair? How is it possible to crush out a legitimate industry by law which only requires its product to be sold for what it is?

The protest made by the friends of imitation butter that the bill will ruin them is a protest against the enforcement of the anti-coloring oleomargarine laws passed by 32 States of the Union; a protest in defiance of the expressed will of more than fifty millions of the people of the United States; and a confession that they depend on selling their imitation and fraudulently advertised commodity for butter in order to continue a monopoly of that business and to add to their already overgrown coffers.

While I do not, on principle, fully approve some features of this bill, and would cheerfully support some other practical measure, if possible to draft one to accomplish its purpose equally as well, freed from its obnoxious features, yet, inasmuch as the able committee reporting this bill, after full and careful deliberation, have concluded that this is the most effective measure they are able to present to reach the evils sought to be cured, I am willing to yield to the emergency and give it my support. It is alleged that the passage of this bill will destroy a great industry and prevent the further manufacture of oleomargarine. The absurdity of this pretense is apparent when we recall the fact that 32 States of the Union now have laws prohibiting the sale of oleomargarine colored in imitation of butter, namely (in order of population, census of 1890):

Population.	Population.
New York..... 5,937,853	South Carolina..... 1,151,149
Pennsylvania..... 5,228,014	Nebraska..... 1,058,910
Illinois..... 3,830,351	Maryland..... 1,042,360
Ohio..... 3,672,516	West Virginia..... 762,794
Missouri..... 2,679,134	Connecticut..... 746,253
Massachusetts..... 2,238,943	Maine..... 601,086
Michigan..... 2,093,889	Colorado..... 412,198
Iowa..... 1,911,899	New Hampshire..... 376,530
Kentucky..... 1,858,635	Washington..... 349,380
Georgia..... 1,837,353	Oregon..... 313,767
Tennessee..... 1,736,518	Vermont..... 312,442
Wisconsin..... 1,686,880	South Dakota..... 328,808
Virginia..... 1,655,989	Utah..... 297,905
Alabama..... 1,513,017	North Dakota..... 182,711
New Jersey..... 1,444,933	Delaware..... 168,493
Minnesota..... 1,301,826	
California..... 1,208,130	Total population..... 50,117,440

The States and Territories which have not yet passed laws prohibiting the sale of oleomargarine colored in imitation of butter are, with populations:

Population.	Population.
Texas..... 2,235,623	New Mexico..... 153,593
Indiana..... 2,192,404	Montana..... 132,156
North Carolina..... 1,617,947	Idaho..... 84,385
Kansas..... 1,427,086	Oklahoma..... 61,834
Mississippi..... 1,289,700	Wyoming..... 60,705
Arkansas..... 1,128,179	Arizona..... 59,620
Louisiana..... 1,118,587	Nevada..... 45,761
Florida..... 821,422	
Rhode Island..... 345,506	Total population..... 12,604,790
District of Columbia..... 230,392	

These laws, while varying in form, express the opinion of the lawmaking representatives of the 60,000,000 people now living in the States named.

If in connection with the foregoing table we consider the statement that the oleomargarine factories of the United States have more than doubled their output in the last four years, we can readily see that the claim put forward by the oleomargarine advocates is a fallacy pure and simple. The aggregate output of the

imitation product of these factories for the year 1897 was 45,000,000 pounds, and in 1899 the amount had risen to 83,000,000 pounds, and it is claimed that for this year it will reach about 104,000,000 pounds, an annual increase of more than 20 per cent. Of this vast amount of oleomargarine manufactured and sold it is estimated that the greater part was consumed under the belief that it was butter. If it were not for the fact, as I understand the situation, that such a large per cent of this product is palmed off and sold as butter, and that purchasers and consumers have no adequate protection against the deception, this measure would not have the support it manifestly has from the farmers and butter consumers of the United States. Congress was not appealed to and importuned until every other method of protection to the dairy interests from this unfair, fraudulent, and ruinous competition had been exhausted.

A majority of the States of the Union have enacted laws forbidding oleomargarine being colored in imitation of butter, but from the very nature of things these laws have been found inefficient. Oleomargarine manufactured in one State can be sold in another in violation of law, and the officials of neither State can successfully trace the shipment and enforce the law. It is not the manufacture of the commodity known as oleomargarine or butterine that is sought to be affected by the provisions of this bill.

The bill does not seek to change or alter existing law to the prejudice of a single manufacturer of these articles. It does not attempt in any manner to deprive them of any legitimate rights they now enjoy in this regard. It strikes at the source of the evil by saying to the manufacturer of oleomargarine, colored in imitation of butter, that he shall pay a tax in such an amount that its cost to the retailer will approximately be equal to that of butter, and thereby remove the incentive to fraud. It is conceded that oleomargarine can be manufactured at a cost not to exceed 7 cents per pound, and can be sold at a fair profit for from 10 to 12 cents per pound. If he was forced to place on the market and sell his commodity for what it is, and purchasers and consumers were given to understand what they were buying when they purchased it, the competition arising out of the conduct of such a business would be one of which no one could justly complain.

But when this commodity is colored in imitation of butter, advertised as butter, and sold as butter to an unsuspecting public it becomes a matter of serious concern to the more than five million of farmers who depend either directly or indirectly on the butter market for their well-being. It becomes a fraud and unfair competitor in the markets of the producers of butter as well as a deception upon the whole consuming public. I know that one of the stock arguments used against this bill is that it will destroy an industry that is now engaged in the manufacture of a pure and healthful article of food that enters into the use and consumption of the poor at a price much cheaper than creamery butter and that is preferred by many to butter.

This argument is employed by the representatives of the oleomargarine interests, and is presented with such plausibility by its advocates that many of the labor organizations of the country have been induced to make protests against its passage. They have been persuaded to believe that such a measure of legislation is an unjust interference with their rights to purchase, if they choose, this cheaper article instead of the higher-priced and, as they claim, less desirable article of pure butter. But the facts of the case, as demonstrated by the experience of years and the weight of evidence, not only does not sustain this view, but, on the other hand, shows that these fears are groundless. The fact is that under existing conditions and the almost universal practice oleomargarine has been and is being sold to the poor, but in most instances is sold as butter and for butter prices.

Under the operation of this bill, if enacted into law, not only will no restrictions be imposed upon the rights of the oleomargarine producer to sell his commodity, but no interference whatever is proposed with the right of anyone to purchase that commodity; but provision is made to safeguard the purchaser and to enable him to secure the article for what it is and for a fair price—for the price of oleomargarine, and not for butter—while at the same time it forbids the manufacturer to color and place his product on the market for something it is not.

In the case of *Plumley vs. The State of Massachusetts*, Plumley had been convicted under the Massachusetts law of selling a compound known as oleomargarine, colored in semblance of butter. The case was carried to the supreme court of the State, where the judgment was affirmed; it was then appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. The defense was that Plumley was held under a statute which was unconstitutional. That this case and the points involved may be understood, I here insert a statement of the case and an extract from the opinion of Judge Harlan in delivering the judgment of the majority of the Court in that case:

The statute in that case prevented the sale of this substance in imitation of yellow butter produced from pure, unadulterated milk or cream of the same, and the statute contained a proviso that nothing therein should be construed to prohibit the manufacture or sale of oleomargarine in a sepa-

rate or distinct form and in such manner as will advise the consumer of its real character, free from coloration or ingredients that cause it to look like butter." The court held that a conviction under that statute for having sold an article known as oleomargarine, not produced from unadulterated milk or cream, but manufactured in imitation of yellow butter produced from pure, unadulterated milk or cream, was valid. Attention was called in the opinion to the fact that the statute did not prohibit the manufacture or sale of all oleomargarine, but only such as was colored in imitation of yellow butter produced from unadulterated milk or cream of such milk.

If free from coloration or ingredient that caused it to look like butter, the right to sell it in a separate and distinct form and in such manner as would advise the consumer of the real character was neither restricted nor prohibited. The court held that under the statute the party was only forbidden to practice in such matters a fraud upon the general public; that the statute seeks to suppress false pretenses and to promote fair dealing in the sale of an article of food, and that it compels the sale of oleomargarine for what it really is by preventing its sale for what it is not; that the term "commerce among the States" did not mean a recognition of a right to practice a fraud upon the public in the sale of an article even if it had become the subject of trade in different parts of the country.

Judge Harlan, in delivering this opinion, said:

And yet it is supposed the owners of a compound which has been put in a condition to cheat the public into believing it is a particular article of food in daily use and eagerly sought for by people in every condition of life are protected by the Constitution in making a sale of it against the will of the States in which it is offered for sale because of the circumstance that it is in an original package and has become a subject of ordinary traffic. We are unwilling to accept this view. We are of the opinion that it is within the power of a State to exclude from its markets any compound manufactured in another State which has been artificially colored or adulterated so as to cause it to look like an article of food in general use, and the sale of which may, by reason of such coloration or adulteration, cheat the general public into purchasing that which they may not intend to buy.

The Constitution of the United States does not secure to anyone the privilege of defrauding the public. The deception against which the statute of Massachusetts is aimed is an offense against society. The States are as competent to protect their people against such offenses or wrongs as they are to protect them against crimes or wrongs of more serious character. And this protection may be given without violating any right secured by the national Constitution and without infringing the authority of the General Government. A State enactment forbidding the sale of deceitful imitations of articles of food in general use among the people does not abridge any privilege secured to citizens of the United States, nor in any just sense interfere with the freedom of commerce among the several States.

Will it be contended that if oleomargarine can be forced upon the market for just what it is and sold at prices that such a commodity will command in the market that any purchaser, rich or poor, will be either deprived of the article itself or compelled to pay a higher price to obtain it? Certainly such a contention is an open concession of the fallacy of the whole theory of the opposition to this bill. It is a frank admission that in order to continue in the business they must practice the fraud of coloring their goods in imitation of butter. This means that if they are forced to comply with the requirements of this bill they will in the future be unable to obtain the high prices for their goods that they have been receiving in the past. And this admission ought to be the most conclusive evidence to the purchaser that under the provisions of this bill the purchaser of oleomargarine will be able to obtain his butter supply, if he prefers the oleomargarine to the dairy or creamery article, at a much lower price than he now pays, if not colored in imitation of genuine butter.

If, however, he prefers the use of colored oleomargarine, and wishes to purchase this quality because he places a higher value upon it, for his purposes, than genuine butter, then he would be compelled to pay approximately the higher price of dairy butter to obtain it; and there is no reason why he should not. The very object of the pending bill is to force the oleomargarine manufacturer, if he persists in the fraudulent practice of coloring his product in imitation of butter, either to accommodate the wishes of his customers, or to obtain higher prices for his product, or both, to raise the price of such commodity to approximately the market price of genuine dairy butter in order to make a profit from its sale, and thus preserve to the farmer and dairymen their market as against the competition of this spurious compound.

It will no doubt have the tendency of raising the price and giving to the producers of dairy butter better prices and a larger market for their product. If it did not, it would essentially fail in the accomplishment of the purposes of its author and friends. This is strictly in line with the policy of many laws upon the statute books of various States, which forbid meats of different kinds being placed upon the markets and offered for sale except under their own names. To this end the Agricultural Department has employed eminent chemists, who during the last year have made an examination of and analyzed 39 samples of horse meat with the view of determining a method whereby horse meat may be easily detected if sold under any other name. The same is being done by this Department with reference to other food products.

Again, referring to the bill under consideration, it is claimed and insisted by the friends of the manufactories that the coloring matter used in oleomargarine does not contain any deleterious substance injurious to health, and it is admitted upon both sides that it neither adds to nor detracts from its quality as a food product. This being a fact, there can be no excuse for the use of the coloring matter but to imitate butter, and the only plausible reason for this imitation is to induce the public to believe that it is butter, and this is manifest in the instructions sent out over the

country to their retail customers, accompanied by cards on which are given the different grades of coloring suitable to the color of butter at the different seasons of the year. If it was not intended to deceive the consumer into believing that the article was pure butter, then why adopt the color that so perfectly imitates butter at these different seasons of the year.

The strong and manifest trend of public sentiment for some years past has been to inaugurate a national policy upon the subject of pure food, and to adopt national legislation supplemental to the legislation of the several States to suppress all adulterations of pure food. In quite a number of the States the laws which have been passed have been molded upon the Brosius pure-food bill, which is now pending before this House, and which if passed is believed by those who have given careful study to the subject would secure almost if not perfect control of interstate traffic in adulterated food. Every producer and consumer in this as in all other countries are deeply interested in securing State and Federal legislation that will make absolutely secure the right of the producer and consumer to have placed on the market nothing but pure and unadulterated food, and that the commodity, whatever it may be, whether of the farm or factory, should be exposed for sale and consumption for just what it is.

Every consideration of honesty and justice to the producer and consumer demands that Congress should take early action upon the pure-food bill, to which I have adverted, or some other measure of similar scope and character. Every honest farmer and producer is interested in knowing that his product goes upon the market for just what it is, and will not have to compete in that market with some spurious article in imitation thereof. Every consumer is vitally interested in knowing that when he purchases an article of food he is not deceived into purchasing an adulterated imitation or counterfeit of what he intends to secure.

Pass this bill, and if its provisions shall be enforced the purchaser of one of the staple articles of food will then know what he is getting when he makes his purchase. He will then understand, if he pays the higher price of dairy butter for his oleomargarine, that he does it because he prefers it and not because of any deceit in the sale. Pass this bill and it will afford protection not only to the proprietors but to the guests and patrons of hotels, boarding houses, and restaurants, who usually pay a round price for butter to spread their bread. No, there need be no apprehension or alarm felt among the poor or labor organizations of the country that the cost of their living will in the slightest degree be enhanced by the Grout bill, if it shall become a law, unless they prefer pure creamery or dairy butter; but, on the contrary, they have every assurance that so far as this item of oleomargarine, uncolored, affects that cost, it will be materially reduced.

Again, it is urged that this is an effort to strike down and destroy a great industry involving large sums of money and capital invested in manufacturing plants. The friends of this bill disclaim any such purpose, and deny that such can or will be its effect if passed. That large investments have been made in machinery and equipments of the twenty-six or more oleomargarine and butterine plants of the country will not be disputed. Much exaggeration has, however, characterized the statements made as to the extent and magnitude of these interests. One among the largest, if not the largest, oleomargarine manufacturers in the country is the firm of William J. Moxley & Co., of Chicago. The value of this plant, fixtures, and machinery, according to the latest statement made by that firm to one of our most reliable mercantile agencies, is \$30,850.63. As estimated, there are about twenty-six such firms in the United States, the majority of them smaller and with less capital invested. The Moxley plant being estimated at \$30,000, it is fair to assume, the others being smaller and with less invested in machinery and fixtures, that the average value of these plants would be about \$25,000. Upon this basis the twenty-six oleomargarine plants in the United States would aggregate \$650,000.

I have not the data at hand to accurately state the number of creameries in my own State, but I may safely say that the number is much less than that of the State of Wisconsin, and we have the statement made upon this floor by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAHLE], who seems to have given most careful attention to this subject, that there are in that State alone 951 creameries, with an average value of \$2,700. According to this statement the total value of the plants, machinery, and fixtures of the creameries in this State alone would be \$2,567,700. When you compare, therefore, the value of the oleomargarine factories, estimated at \$650,000, in the United States with the aggregate value of the plants and creamery factories of the single State of Wisconsin of \$2,567,700, it will readily be seen how insignificant the amount invested in the imitation business is when compared with the legitimate industry.

The representatives of the oleomargarine business have laid great stress upon the magnitude of their establishments, the amount of capital employed, and the large number of people they employ as a reason why they should be permitted to continue

their fraudulent practices. As has been said, if the amount invested shall be the test, how infinitesimally small is the voice of the oleomargarine interests in this discussion as compared with the stupendous investments in the legitimate pursuits of the great body of our people in the farm and dairy butter-making business throughout the country, the annual cash value of whose product exceeds \$600,000,000.

But I do not insist that this is the proper gauge of battle. I do not maintain that the fate of this measure should be made to depend upon any such an issue. Its merits or demerits should be decided upon more substantial and defensible grounds. The necessity for some relief by Federal legislation for the consumer and legitimate butter producer can not be more clearly emphasized than by the admitted fact that immense quantities of oleomargarine, colored in imitation of butter, is from year to year sold in the States where such sales are absolutely prohibited by State law.

It has been the proud boast of all those who have assumed to speak for their parties in the great struggle of contending forces in political campaigns that they were the especial friends of the farmer and of the great agricultural interests of the country. This is the first great measure designed to conserve this interest that has been introduced in the American Congress for many years. Now that an opportunity is presented to demonstrate the good faith of these assurances so often and so enthusiastically given to the farmer, let the friend of the American farmer not desert him in his hour of need; let him attest that friendship and his fidelity to his interest by casting his vote for the pending bill.

Army Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. STARK,

OF NEBRASKA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, December 5, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 4300) to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States—

Mr. STARK said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not intend to make any speech upon the Army bill. During the campaign I told my people that I would vote to extend the present military establishment for a reasonable time, but that I should resist any permanent increase in the Regular Army of the United States. I have been able to keep faith with them and cast my vote as promised on both propositions, and it is only by reason of things that have recently come to pass that I have concluded to avail myself of leave to print at this time.

We are at last face to face with the question we have been approaching ever since the vision of colonial possessions first appeared to those who have leadership in shaping the destinies of our nation. It is the custom of gentlemen of the opposition to feel their way and approach conclusions by successive steps, protesting meanwhile that each shall be the last. In the days of James G. Blaine they abhorred the single gold standard. Later they reluctantly tolerated it until it could be abolished by international agreement. They now pronounce it to be the "foundation of the best financial system the world has ever seen."

They were once for the protection of American home industries. Their last national platform changes the phrase to a demand for the protection of American labor—no matter whether of Chinese, Portuguese, or Malay origin, so that the American flag of conquest has been raised over the territory they occupy—and the next step will be to abolish all trade restrictions, to the end that "the sails of American commerce may whiten every sea and our manufacturers displace in the markets of China and Japan the manufactured goods of England or any other European people." They once loathed trusts; now "there are good and bad trusts," and as they fear to strike at any of them lest they should hit a friend, it requires no gift of divination to see what the end will be. The following extract from a late issue of the Springfield (Mass.) Republican shows how the trusts have been affected by their triumph:

Standard Oil trust stock sold this week on the curb market at New York at \$23 a share, which is \$275 a share more than this security was quoted at prior to the election last month. The last previous sale was at \$736 or thereabouts, and scant respect is shown to the President's message in its relation to anti-trust legislation when such a stock jumps up \$229 a share on the very day of the message's publication.

Conquest and forcible annexation were once wrong according to Republican principles, but they purpose to ask the Almighty to amend the decalogue as they amend the Declaration of Independence, and it is soon to be written that men of swarthy skin

are inferior to Anglo-Saxons, incapable of self-government and intended by Providence to be the wards of the chief liberty-loving people of the globe, whose Christian duty it will be to tax them without representation and protect them (on paper) from the intoxicating liquors and immoral influences in which superior races may be supposed to very safely and properly indulge.

There was a time when Republican speakers gloried in our small standing Army, in the peaceful tendencies of our people, in the adequacy of a right course respecting the liberties of others. They said that our great reserve force of patriotic volunteers was at all times sufficient for purposes of defense, and that there never would or should be criminal aggression. Then came a skillful plea for the greatest measure of liberty that inferior peoples are capable of enjoying, and finally the same pious platitudes and meaningless mouthings with which England has for centuries been speaking of the nations she exploits.

This change of attitude required a change in the military establishment of our country. A temporary law was enacted, and this is to be supplanted by the permanent increase as provided by this bill. What lasting good will be accomplished thereby is for gentlemen of the opposition to demonstrate, but the great burden which it will entail is ably presented by Congressman McCALL, of Massachusetts, who in a recent speech has made for his party a compilation of its comparative cost with that of the military expenses of other leading nations. He said:

The motive that had been most widely put forth was that it was for our advantage, and especially our pecuniary advantage. As a part of the cost of this policy we are to include the greater expense under this bill, which is the first-born and legitimate offspring of the policy. Those who compare our standing army with the standing armies of Europe usually are careful not to compare the relative costs. The French army costs \$125,000,000 a year, the German \$130,000,000, the British \$100,000,000, and the Russian \$153,000,000. These figures include pensions and fortifications. If this bill passes, the War Department will need \$113,000,000. There is another cost not included in these figures, which is a necessary incident to an army, and as much a part of its cost as the pay of the soldiers. That is the pension system. We are appropriating for that purpose \$145,000,000 a year. Our total charges, therefore, for military purposes are \$268,000,000 a year—an amount greater than the joint military expenses of those two armed rivals, France and Germany.

I realize to the fullest extent that it is useless to present argument on the Army bill at this stage of the proceedings. In form, I am discussing legislation supposed to be under deliberation by representatives of the people. In fact, I am speaking of a measure devised by party leaders, framed in the War Department, with which popular representation had nothing whatever to do, and passed without any discussion worthy the name by the votes of those who seem to make allegiance to party the supreme test of good citizenship. It can profit my constituents little for me to assume that I am debating a proposition that is already decided, and I therefore choose to avail myself of the general leave to print in placing before them facts they might not gather from any other source, and that I think it to their interest they be advised of.

I live in Nebraska, the home of William J. Bryan, upon whom much ridicule has been bestowed, but to whom an unworthy sentiment or an unmanly action has never been imputed. He has been defeated, and though majorities are not always right, their will should always be respected until they in turn become minorities. No true American questions this, but if the victorious party is not great enough to be generous it should at least be just, and not seek to create false impressions because they have the power to manipulate figures and have control of a large majority of the news-distributing agencies.

William J. Bryan received but 1,920 votes less in Nebraska in 1900 than he did in 1896, and I will hereafter adduce explanations to show that he has really suffered no loss whatever of friends or influence in his home State. The Fusionists have not lost, but the Republicans have gained. We are no weaker, but they have, from some mysterious source, received reinforcements. Making allowance for a trick played upon some of our voters at the polls, we see that more Nebraskans than ever before rallied under our banner, only to be outnumbered; overwhelmed, but neither silenced nor convinced.

William J. Bryan received more—not less—votes than did our fusion State ticket. He was substantially a thousand in advance of Governor Poynter and more than 2,000 ahead of any other of our State nominees.

From whence, then, came this influx of voters into a State which a comparison of the official censuses for 1890 and 1900, both taken entirely by Republican enumerators, shows to have been almost stationary in population during the whole of the last decade? The comparison furnished me on personal application to the Census Department is as follows:

ADVANCE BULLETIN OF POPULATION.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, CENSUS OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., November 27, 1900.Hon. WILLIAM R. MERRIAM,
Director of the Census.

Sir: I have the honor to report that the population of the State of Nebraska, according to the official count of the returns of the Twelfth Census, is as follows: 1900, 1,068,539; 1890, 1,058,910. These figures show an increase in the population of the State since 1890 of 9,629, or 0.9 per cent. The population

in 1880 was 452,402, showing an increase of 606,506, or 134 per cent, from 1880 to 1890.

(For population of Nebraska by counties, see attached sheets.)

Very respectfully,

WM. C. HUNT,
Chief Statistician.

Population of Nebraska, by counties, 1900.

Counties.	Population, 1900.	Counties.	Population, 1900.
The State	1,068,539	Howard	10,343
Adams	18,840	Jefferson	15,196
Antelope	11,344	Johnson	11,197
Banner	1,114	Kearney	9,866
Blaine	603	Keith	1,951
Boone	11,689	Keyapaha	3,076
Boxbutte	5,572	Kimball	758
Boyd	7,332	Knox	14,343
Brown	3,470	Lancaster	64,835
Buffalo	20,254	Lincoln	11,416
Burt	13,040	Logan	960
Butler	15,703	Loup	1,305
Cass	21,330	McPherson	517
Cedar	12,467	Madison	16,976
Chase	2,559	Merrick	9,255
Cherry	6,541	Nance	8,222
Cheyenne	5,570	Nemaha	14,952
Clay	15,735	Nuckolls	12,414
Colfax	11,211	Otoe	22,288
Cuming	14,584	Pawnee	11,770
Custer	19,758	Perkins	1,702
Dakota	6,286	Phelps	10,772
Dawes	6,215	Pierce	8,445
Dawson	12,214	Platte	17,747
Deuel	2,630	Polk	10,542
Dixon	10,535	Red Willow	9,604
Dodge	22,298	Richardson	19,614
Douglas	140,590	Rock	2,809
Dundy	2,434	Saline	18,252
Fillmore	15,087	Sarpy	9,680
Franklin	9,455	Saunders	22,085
Frontier	8,781	Scotts Bluff	2,552
Furnas	12,373	Seward	15,690
Gage	30,051	Sheridan	6,053
Garfield	2,127	Sherman	6,550
Gosper	6,301	Sion	2,055
Grant	753	Stanton	6,959
Greeley	5,691	Thayer	14,325
Hall	17,206	Thomas	628
Hamilton	13,330	Thurston	8,756
Harlan	9,370	Valley	7,339
Hayes	2,708	Washington	13,083
Hitchcock	4,409	Wayne	9,862
Holt	12,224	Webster	11,619
Hooker	432	Wheeler	1,362
		York	18,205

To show how much of an increase would be necessary to honestly account for the result, it will only be necessary to take the highest vote ever previously polled in Nebraska, which was a little less than 225,000 in the year 1896. This year the total vote reaches 251,005, or an increase of more than 25,000 votes over four years ago. This would represent an increase in population of 125,000 people. It is a well-known fact that a number of western and southern counties have lately decreased in population on account of a recent crop failure. The official census returns show that 28 counties out of 90 contain a lessened population, which would leave the increase to be divided among the 62 remaining counties, requiring an average increase of over 2,000 per county for each of these agricultural counties, in none of which is a large city.

As there are on an average not to exceed 20 voting precincts per county, our people will note that to square with the returns there should be in every voting precinct of the counties showing a greater population a hundred new citizens who have established their residence there during the last four years. They may have some difficulty in finding them now that election is over, but they should be placed in evidence. The year 1896 was a Presidential one, and it is said that the fullest vote in the history of the State was cast at that time. Comparing the vote cast for all candidates for Congress in my own district that year with the vote cast for all at the last election, I find that while we have by official figures decreased in population 6,312, we have an increased vote of 1,572, or, in other words, to accord with our diminished population we should have cast 2,834 votes less than were deposited and counted. I make no charge of wholesale fraud or corruption against the party in power. I merely present the grave indictment contained in the figures (their own figures) and allow them to make satisfactory explanations—if they can.

Some things have come to my own knowledge and under my personal observation that should be stated as affecting not only the increased vote, but the distribution of the same. I am informed that census enumerators, in addition to their official duties, made it a point to inquire concerning former residents and where they might be found, and that subsequently many of these parties appeared, claimed that their departure from the State was only temporary, that they intended eventually to return, and voted at our elections. In one instance, at the city of

Schuyler, the challenged elector put in an appearance after an absence of twenty-five years. It is also true that Republicans had a large fund, enabling them to take advantage of a half-fare rate made by Nebraska railroads to enable absentees to come home to vote, and that the fusionists had no money to expend for such a purpose.

Residents of our State are fully aware that the small diminution of our vote could much more than be accounted for by the fact that letters and men were sent out to confuse the voters upon a very unsatisfactory and poorly devised ballot given us by the last Republican legislature, and that, especially in neighborhoods not well versed in the English language, a trick was played whereby the voter was asked to not only vote for the electors on his own ticket, but give the courtesy of a complimentary vote to some one man on the opposition electoral ticket as well. Race preferences were taken advantage of in neighborhoods of German, Bohemian, and Swedish ancestry, and when a man was persuaded to vote for nine electors, his ballot was of course thrown out on that part of the ticket. We have yet to hear of a single county in which there were not a number of this kind of votes, and I append a clipping from the Daily State Journal of December 8 showing how it operated in a single neighborhood:

EIGHTEEN VOTES LOST.

J. J. Langer, one of the Republican electors, when in Lincoln recently was telling some of his friends the result of a story started about him before election. The World-Herald just before November 6 spread the story that Mr. Langer was working systematically to get Fusion Bohemians to vote for him on the ground of his nationality alone. In Saline County the returns showed that some of the Bohemians endeavored to pay their friend a compliment. To his own knowledge 18 ballots voted by Fusionists were spoiled by the voter voting for all the Fusion electors and then for him also.

In addition to the usual methods of pressure brought to bear upon employees, tenants, and borrowers, a new scheme was devised of sending out solicitors for stock shipments before election, these buyers impressing the owner of the stock with a fear that Bryan would be elected, that there would be a panic and no market for either hogs or cattle. This fear of a panic produced a panic on the part of the more timid of the voters, and no doubt contributed its part to the increased strength of President McKinley.

The verified expense account required by our law of treasurers of the State committees of the two parties shows that the Fusion forces expended for political purposes \$10,934.97, and that the Republican fund was \$58,075.41, of which there had been expended at the time the report was made \$56,367.08, leaving a balance of \$1,708.33, and unpaid bills aggregating \$1,361.13. This indicates that they expended from the regular fund more than five times as much money as their opponents, making no account of the fact that their local contributions were much larger, and that they had an immense fund of which no account was made to pay transportation charges for the bringing home of absent voters. An appropriation of \$1,000 for each of 58 selected counties, or even a straight distribution of \$640 to their committee in each county of the State, might be very effective in enabling them to secure results over an adversary whose resources were greatly circumscribed. Their own sworn statements show that Republicans expended an average of more than \$30 to every voting precinct in Nebraska.

These constitute some of the factors that should be known and taken into account when next the voters pass upon the merits and accomplishments of political parties in State and nation. I have devoted some time to a review of the past; let me now call attention to the spirit manifested in the present. All semblance of disguise has been thrown off on the money question. Opposition to the greenbacks, which have for nearly forty years furnished us with a good currency free from interest tribute, is now declared. Those remaining are to be retired, and an interest-bearing bond is to be used as the basis of a bank-note circulation to take their place. The control of the volume of currency, that has so much to do with fixing the price of labor and commodities, is conceded by a Republican Congress to belong to the bankers and not to the representatives of the people. Distinguished Republican Congressmen no longer send forth appeals for the oppressed of Porto Rico. The protests of distinguished Republican Senators against the abrogation of the Declaration of Independence are no longer addressed to the consciences of any portion of their party. They have changed, and in place of their lofty appeals to duty, mere "rills of oily eloquence in soft meanders lubricate the course they take." The Army bill, with its permanent expense, its ever-present dangers, is an all but accomplished fact, and the passage of the pernicious ship subsidy to millionaire mendicants seems to be inevitable. These perils press upon us, and others threaten. What is the spirit of the conquerors? As they say that Mr. Bryan has been their most effective speaker, allow me to submit their own language and demeanor at their Belshazzar festivities in the city of Washington this week, and see how much it will strengthen them in the estimation of thoughtful citizens.

The gathering I speak of was a meeting of the Nebraska Republican Club, which was held on Friday evening, December 7, at

the Rifles' Armory Hall, on G street, Washington, and the occasion was a grand celebration of their victory in the home State of the People's, Independent, Democratic, and Free Silver Republican candidate for President. The hall was one that would contain about three thousand people. Its seating capacity was fully occupied, and perhaps two hundred persons were standing during the fore part of the exercises, there being seats for all before its close. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Edgar C. Snyder, correspondent of the Omaha Bee and private secretary to Senator THURSTON, who pronounced a patriotic declamation, announced a singer of patriotic songs, and renounced the chairmanship in favor of Hon. JOHN M. THURSTON, senior Senator from our State.

The singing won considerable applause, and caused the waving of numerous flags which had been thoughtfully provided for the audience. In well-modulated tones the distinguished permanent chairman then stated that he had agreed not to make a speech, but had a few thoughts to present on the conditions which made the Republican victory in Nebraska so remarkable; that Nebraska was the Populist center of the nation; that Populists were for the most part honest, patriotic men, who organized a reform party with good motives for the betterment of the nation; that like all independent parties they had fallen a prey to one or the other of the older organizations, and it finally transpired that the typical beast emblematic of Democracy had two riders—one faced forward and the other backward. [Great applause.] He then related that while at Lincoln he had seen a swelled frog used in one of the stores for advertising purposes that completely resembled the Fusion forces, as it had a green back, a silver belly, a face like Aguiña'do, could not be trusted, and was as likely to jump one way as another. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. THURSTON grew earnest and impressive as he said that he had faith in our Government, not as an imperial dynasty, or with tendencies in that direction, but as one ever ready to listen to the voice of the people; with a Constitution not destroyed, but amended to meet the needs of an expanding and progressive civilization. He averred that prior to McKinley's Administration "our largest battle ships could sail unnoticed into foreign harbors, but now the smallest boat bearing the American flag is received with 'hats off' in any part of the world." Having concluded this sweeping arraignment of every Republican President from Abraham Lincoln to Benjamin Harrison, he closed with the eloquent peroration that "the name of Washington stands for independence, of Lincoln for liberty, while that of McKinley represents the flag and man's humanity to man"—inadvertently omitting to name the man. Summing up his speech, he first praised Populists and then derided them; revealed by his skillfully turned phrases about necessary amendments to the charter of our Government that he held with Pope, "Manners with fortunes change, humors turn with climes; tenets with books, and principles with times," and it never occurred to him that some people would be fully as well satisfied to belong to an organization resembling a swelled frog, that no matter how uncertain the direction of its jump never jumps backward, than to belong to one that might be typified by the swelled accounts of a Rathbone or the swelled tax roll of a military government.

With extravagant eulogy Hon. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR was then presented, but as he bowed his acknowledgments, Senator HANNA entered, advanced to the front of the stage, and was received with an ovation that far exceeded any demonstration of the evening. Again and again the cheering broke forth, indicating that he was their acknowledged leader; their highest ideal of American manhood. Mr. GROSVENOR with ready tact turned the incident to good account, saying truly that if half the complimentary things spoken of him by the chairman were true, the demonstration was no more than he deserved, put his hearers in high good humor by his pungent pleasantries, and then proceeded to give an account of his experiences in Nebraska the year before when the results were not so satisfactory to his party as in the last campaign. He explained their failure to hearken to his words of wisdom in this wise:

No state has been so thoroughly cursed by the dense ignorance and monumental stupidity of Populism as has Nebraska. Her people neither thought or cared for the dangers of imperialism, militarism, or trusts, because they were just getting rid of the curse of Populism. They had sense enough to know that better times came about as a result of Republican rule. There is not one thing that has happened in the past four years they would care to retain that has not come about as the necessary and inevitable result of a Republican Administration.

He then related how he had striven to keep Senator HANNA from going to Nebraska; that he wanted him to live a great while; that there is no other like him; that of him, as of another great man, it might truthfully be said: "He came, he saw, he conquered." He remarked that it was "pretty cheeky" for Mr. HANNA to go to Lincoln and tell Bryan that he was not fit to be elected to the office of constable, but that an overwhelming victory in the Republican county of Lancaster had followed that declaration.

Not contented with having classified Senator HANNA with imperial Caesar, Mr. GROSVENOR then proceeded to compare him with

Christ, by stating that in his own preliminary tour in 1899 he acted as John the Baptist and was the voice of one crying in the wilderness to prepare the way for a man the latchet of whose shoes he was not worthy to unloose. This nauseating flattery, blasphemous as it was, seemed highly pleasing to both audience and recipient, though we observe that it was omitted in the accounts of the meeting that appeared in the daily papers on the following morning. The Senator's face beamed, his eye kindled with a look of gratification, as though he felt himself appreciated at his true worth, apparently sublimely unconscious of any application of the words of Goldsmith:

Of praise a mere glutton, he swallow'd what came,
And the puff of a dunce, he mistook it for fame;
Till his relish grown callous, almost to disease,
Who pepper'd the highest was surest to please.

He continued with another Scriptural reference, adjuring the Democrats "Ye must be born again," as it was useless to try to reorganize a dead thing. He admitted that he had several times delivered a funeral oration on the demise of the Democratic party when it displayed very vigorous life afterwards, but averred that never under such circumstances had they ever been thoroughly fumigated, and that they always had the odor of the grave about them. He concluded with the good old anecdote of two young men who possessed a joint stock mother-in-law. After vibrating between the two households for some years the lady finally died at one of them. The telegram sent to the other was as follows: "Mother-in-law dead. Shall I embalm, cremate, or inter?" Answer. "The reply soon came, 'Embalm, cremate, and inter. Quickly and deeply.'" This he suggested as the proper course to be pursued with Bryanism. Comment on such a speech could not make its weakness or malice more apparent, and it is submitted without argument. The best natured part of it was the mother-in-law story, and it suggests another of equal veracity and antiquity:

A boy asked his teacher's permission to absent himself from school to attend another boy's funeral. Permission was readily granted and Johnny departed. But as the teacher was on her way home late that afternoon she met her absent scholar.

"And Johnny," asked the teacher, "did you attend your friend's funeral?"

"No, marm," replied Johnny. "I went to the house, but the boy wasn't dead. We had a high old time wrestling until he throwed me flat 'f my back. 'F you think he's dead, you just tackle him; that's all."

Auditor Andrews then read in precise accents a few formal letters of regret from distinguished individuals who were not able to be present, being assisted therein by Mr. Snyder, who had a better voice and more agreeable presence. The list of names was very imposing, but none of the communications rose above the level of commonplace, the most noticeable and original idea contained in any of them being the statement by ex-Senator Manderston that "Populism is a combination of imbecility and dishonesty."

Then once more did the honorable chairman take his turn at the treacle. He rose to "introduce one man whom Republicans always delight to honor, and deservedly so—one of our most patriotic citizens, who is yet, perhaps, to receive higher honors. He has been mistaken for the devil with horns by members of the opposition, and this is perhaps not unnatural, as he has now for the second time given them a devil of a licking. In his new rôle of orator I wish to present Our Mark."

Thunders of enthusiastic applause followed this presentation and the appearance of the man who, with Rough Rider Roosevelt, possesses the exact degree of intelligence and higher civilization to enable them to share equally first honors at the gatherings of latter-day Republicans. With a placid smile at the plaudits he had evoked, the hero remarked:

This reminds me of Nebraska. I have often appeared in the same rôle and I notice that all our speakers are glad to avail themselves of the audience I draw. The only reason that GROSVENOR did not want me to go to Nebraska was because he was not going along. I take the result of this election in Nebraska to be an indication that people are returning to their senses, and the reclamation of that State is what seems to me significant as the dawning of a new sun all over our country. If there was any one reason more than another why I consented to undertake the management of another campaign, it was because I had a feeling that my work had not been entirely finished; that I had overlooked a few States west of the Missouri River.

I claim no unequal share in the results in that or any other State. I do claim that never in my political experience in the management of affairs has there been a State more thoroughly organized or one in which the leaders worked so loyally. It is through organization more than any other agency in closely contested elections that victory comes.

Of course loyalty and patriotism are necessary auxiliaries for the workers, but organization is everything.

In order to match the celebrated calf story with which Hon. Theodore Roosevelt is wont to illustrate his own rugged and invincible honesty, Mr. HANNA closed his address by repeating a pleasant incident that occurred during his Nebraska travels. He was at one point asked to come to the rear end of the train to have his picture taken. As he stepped to the platform his eye fell upon the engineer, who was dressed in his working clothes.

Desiring to establish the fact once and for all time that he was not proud and haughty, and that his heart beats in sympathy with

and love for the common people, Senator HANNA advanced, thrust his arm through that of his humble companion, and made use of the following language:

Come with me, and we will both have our pictures taken. We are two engineers—you and I; I am running the Republican party and you are running me. The picture was taken in this manner, and I shall always remember my side partner, as I called him (aside to Mr. Snyder, "What was his name?"), Burden, oh, yes, Burden. I shall never forget him nor the pleasant occurrence I have related.

With praise and panegyric Congressman LITTLEFIELD was then presented and made his stately bow. His remarks should always be read in a deep bass voice and very rapidly. He mentioned the birth throes of Nebraska, the political delirium of Populism, thought it very significant that Bryan failed to carry his own ward or city, but sneeringly intimated that he might have his own family with him; paraded the time-honored joke about the resemblance between Bryan and the Platte River, adding thereto a postscript which he claimed as an original discovery that the resemblance was further continued, as the "Platte is growing shaler and shallower every year;" accepted Mr. HANNA's story and referred to him several times as the "chief engineer," and closed with a plea for a divisor that would give Nebraska six Congressmen by way of recognition of their splendid services to the cause of the Republican party.

Assistant Secretary Brigham followed, speaking of "the blight of Populism." It will be noticed that while nominally rejoicing over the defeat of Democracy, the bitterest ridicule and denunciation was heaped upon the party that their chairman had said was in the main composed of honest men, actuated by good motives. Some of the speakers must have known of the condition of the Nebraska State government, of our State school fund, and State treasury when it passed under fusion control, and of the condition in which these are returned to the charge of that party which had before proved so unfaithful to its trust; but there was not in the whole exercises one word of frank admission of past misgovernment, nor of commendation to fusionists for their great accomplishments. There are to-day several Republican States that could be mentioned, which would do well to experience a few years of the "curse" or "scourge" of Populism. We append an extract from the Omaha Bee of the same date as the meeting, showing not only the satisfactory condition of the funds, but admitting a small part of the former losses due to the rule of men whose protestations of love for the flag and professions of loyalty were no less vehement than those heard at Rifles Armory hall on Friday evening last:

STATE TREASURY BALANCES—SEMIANNUAL REPORT SHOWS \$600,000—UNINVESTED SCHOOL FUND REDUCED—STATE TREASURER MESERVE MAKES A SHOWING OF HIS DEPARTMENT'S OPERATIONS DURING THE TIME SINCE JUNE 1 LAST.

LINCOLN, December 6, 1900.

Treasurer Meserve to-day submitted his last semiannual report for inspection by Governor Poynter. The document was filed in the executive department, and will be supplemented on December 31 by a final report covering the last month of the present treasurer's term of office. The disbursements of the State treasury during the six months ending with December were \$1,372,406.17, while the receipts for the same period, not including the balance on May 31, were \$1,166,142.80. The total balance of all funds on December 1 was \$615,018.34, and the total balance at the beginning of the period was \$819,281.71.

Of the total balance \$159,947.95 are contained in the educational trust and endowment funds. Whatever portions of these funds that remain uninvested when Treasurer Meserve retires from office must be turned over to his successor in actual money. It is estimated now that the uninvested school money at the end of the present month will amount to slightly more than \$150,000.

During the six months covered by the report the suspended account, made by shortages and losses in bank failures, was reduced by the payment of \$36,897.08, of which \$35,454.27 was dividends on the State's deposit in the Capital National Bank, and \$1,442.81 a partial payment of the State's deposit in the Exchange Bank, of Atkinson. Of the total of \$337,763.27 of State money deposited in banks that failed, only \$35,953.27 has been recovered, leaving the broken banks still owing the State \$301,808.

It will be noticed that Congressman LITTLEFIELD asked as a reward for the exertions of Nebraska Republicans that a basis of enumeration be fixed upon that would entitle the State to retain its present membership, and Republicans are urging Fusion Congressmen to join in making such an effort and stand for an apportionment that will not lessen the power nor prestige we now have. The thought had occurred to me that they were, perhaps, a little more interested from the standpoint of party than of public interest, but there was no evidence that such was the case until after the publication of an interview given by Congressman BURKETT to a correspondent of the Omaha Bee, which will be submitted a little later.

Section 1, Article II, of the Constitution, provides that—

Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress.

Because of that provision the electoral college is now made up of 447 members, being the exact equivalent of 90 United States Senators and 357 Congressmen.

It must not be forgotten that upon the apportionment now made will depend the membership of the electoral college for the next ten years.

In the interview reported in the Omaha Bee of December 6 my esteemed colleague says:

Of course, I surmise that the Republicans will try not to give the Democrats any unnecessary advantage in numbers in either place. If the present membership of 357 should be retained and an apportionment be made on that basis, considering that the States would go politically as they did at the last election, the Republicans would lose in the electoral college 1 vote each from Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Nebraska, and Ohio, or a total of 6, and would gain 1 each from Illinois, Minnesota, New Jersey, and New York, or a total of 4, thus leaving them with a net loss of 2.

OPPOSITION WOULD WIN.

On the other hand, by this arrangement the Democrats would lose 1 each in Kentucky, South Carolina, and Virginia, making a total loss of 3, and would gain 1 in Colorado, Louisiana, and 2 in Texas, or a total gain of 4, leaving them a net gain of 1, while the Republicans would have a net loss of 2. If the basis for membership should be 360, the Republicans would lose 4 and gain 11, a net gain of 7, while the Democrats would lose 1 and gain 6, a net gain of 5.

If the membership were placed at 395, no State would lose anything in its delegation nor in the electoral college, for the Republicans would gain 24 and the Democrats would gain 14. This latter is the best number of the three to settle upon, from a Republican standpoint.

A membership of 395 would make the House of Representatives more expensive and cumbersome than at present. There is no reason why Nebraska, because of political reasons, should ask the representatives of the whole nation for a divisor that will prevent her from suffering less than sister States from either a padded or an insufficient census, or give to her undue representation that she has not the population to justify, and believing that 395 members would be an unprecedented and unnecessary increase, I shall oppose it.

A word of explanation about my vote on the Army bill will now be in order.

The Taft commission fixed a sixty-day limit for the conclusion of the Philippine conflict after the election of President McKinley. If the struggle is so soon to end, and we have the reputation as combatants spoken of by Senator THURSTON, it is difficult to see the need of more than trebling our Army. Judging by the speeches made in my district by visiting statesmen during the last campaign, it would seem to be much cheaper and more effective—the football season being over—to employ some of their megaphone experts to go there and send reverberating over their hills in tones of thunder the disheartening intelligence that “Bryan is licked,” and if the rebellion can really be shortened in this way we should prefer such method to the sending over of ships and soldiers.

I was willing to go to the extent of giving my support to the resolution of Congressman McCLELLAN to recommit the bill for the purpose of extending the temporary army until June 30, 1903, but was forced by my convictions of right to vote against a measure placing so much power in the hands of a single man. This I would have done had that man been William J. Bryan, whose fellow-citizens regard with undiminished respect and admiration, and who stands in defeat, as he would have done in victory, the greatest living American.

The Grout Bill.

SPEECH OF HON. LOT THOMAS, OF IOWA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 7, 1900.

On the bill (H. R. 8717) to make oleomargarine and other imitation dairy products subject to the laws of the State or Territory into which they are transported, and to change the tax on oleomargarine.

Mr. THOMAS of Iowa said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Inventive genius, within the last half century, has contributed very materially to the advancement of the dairy interests in this country. The art of invention has brought into use new processes in the development of the dairy farm, and the methods of butter and cheese making have been improved, in a degree, to keep pace with the advancements made in the other industrial pursuits characterizing the general development of a uniform and harmonious industrial system. Scientific investigations have led to improved methods of manufacture and to the improvement of the dairy farms and herds. They have operated within the area of country engaged in the dairy business, have widened its field of activity, and increased the products of the farms.

Cooperative associations have been organized in nearly every community where dairy farming is carried on; and they have proven of great benefit in the dissemination of valuable information pertaining to the business of dairying, the improvement of the dairy herds, and the introduction of the best appliances for use in the operation of the business.

By intelligence in the skillful operation a pure product is produced for which a ready market is found everywhere. The tables of the rich and poor alike demand a supply of pure butter. This demand has led to the building up of a great industry, requiring large amounts of capital and the employment of millions of our people. It gives diversity to agricultural pursuits, and has thus enlarged the field of agricultural possibilities, until today it has become one of the chief wealth-producing sources of the farming communities. The demand for the pure and unadulterated product has widened the field of production, and has engaged inventive genius to produce an article to supply that demand acceptable to the consumers in quality.

Manufacturers of pure creamery and dairy butter have, by persistent efforts and the expenditures of large amounts of money, and by honest dealing, built up a reputation for their product that affords it a ready market. To all the benefits of this reputation, as the result of their own efforts, they are entitled, and they have as just a claim for protection as the person who by his genius has invented some article useful in the development of our commercial and other industries.

The demand for pure butter has made the industry of producing it profitable and has created a good price for the pure article.

This has led others not engaged in the dairy business to produce a counterfeit or imitation of butter, commonly called oleomargarine, and place it on the market as pure creamery or dairy butter. It is claimed that oleomargarine is a good, healthful food product, not inferior to genuine butter made from pure cream. Whether this be true or not it is not material to stop here to inquire.

By using certain coloring in its manufacture oleomargarine is made to resemble genuine butter and is put on the market and sold not as oleomargarine, but as pure butter. By coloring it to resemble butter and offering it for sale as such the manufacturers are, on the reputation of pure butter as a food product and the demand that has been created for it, enabled to sell the counterfeit product at the prices of pure butter, while its actual value and cost of production are much less.

The oleomargarine manufacturers and dealers are not willing to place their product on the market on its own reputation. But, for the purpose of increasing their sales and enhancing their profits, they are seeking to appropriate to their own use and purpose the reputation established by the manufacturer of pure butter, without having contributed anything to build up and establish that reputation. The dairy farmer has, by many years of persistent effort, gained a market for his product, which, it is conceded on all sides, can not be produced so cheaply as oleomargarine, and now the producer of the counterfeit article is placing his product upon the market and offering it for sale as pure butter, having manufactured it and colored it so as to resemble the pure article so closely that the counterfeit can not be detected by the ordinary dealer, and by so doing brings his counterfeit and cheaper article in direct competition with the genuine product of the dairy farmer. This is a fraud, not only upon the manufacturer and honest dealer in pure creamery and dairy butter, but also upon the consumer who buys the spurious article and pays butter prices for it, believing that it is genuine butter.

It is not the purpose or design of the producer or dealer in butter manufactured from pure cream or milk to interfere with or prohibit the oleomargarine manufacturer or dealer from manufacturing or selling oleomargarine. But they claim the right to insist that the oleomargarine shall be sold, if at all, upon its own merits and reputation, and not upon the reputation and merits that the manufacturers and dealers of pure butter have acquired for their product at great expense and toil for many years.

In order that the fraud may be perpetrated by selling the oleomargarine as butter it is artificially colored so as to resemble genuine butter. This coloring is not a necessary ingredient to improve its condition as a useful or healthful food product. It is admitted by manufacturers and dealers and those who have made investigation into the subject that the only purpose of adding the coloring is to make it resemble pure butter and to make it marketable as such.

If oleomargarine is a pure food product—and we have no purpose to controvert the fact now—the right may be conceded to manufacture it and place it on the market with the same freedom that other producers have in relation to their products, but in doing so manufacturers and dealers in that product should be required to rely upon the merits and reputation of the product they produce, and not be permitted to color it artificially so as to resemble pure butter, and by that means be enabled to place it in the field of commerce for sale in competition in the markets of the country with the genuine article, depending upon the reputation of pure butter for an enhanced market value of the spurious product over and above its cost and market value as oleomargarine.

For the purpose of confining oleomargarine in the markets of the country within the limits of its own reputation and actual merits as a food product, a number of the States have enacted

laws prohibiting the sale of oleomargarine and like products when artificially colored so as to resemble butter made from pure milk or cream. This is one of the purposes of the bill now before the House.

The creamery and dairy manufacturers have, for a number of years, been trying to inaugurate some system or adopt some measure that would prevent the manufacturers of and dealers in oleomargarine from placing their imitation product on the market and selling it as genuine butter. To accomplish this purpose they have appealed to both Congress and the legislatures of the several States, and in answer to this appeal a majority of the States have enacted laws with the accomplishment of that object in view.

Thirty States, having a population, according to the census of 1900, of 58,402,142, have laws on their statute books prohibiting the sale of oleomargarine artificially colored in imitation of butter manufactured from pure milk or cream, and designed to be sold as butter.

Two States, having a population of 1,302,591, prohibit the sale of imitation butter not made from pure milk or cream, unless it be colored pink.

The District of Columbia and seven States, having a population of 8,252,833, require that oleomargarine and similar imitations of butter shall be put up in packages and labeled or stamped with the name of the contents of the package, and shall only be sold in such packages properly labeled and stamped.

From this statement it will be seen that 39 States and the District of Columbia, with a population of 67,857,566, out of a total population in all the States and Territories of 76,285,220, have taken cognizance of the action of the manufacturers of and dealers in oleomargarine of artificially coloring their product to resemble pure butter with the purpose of placing it on the market and selling it as such, in competition with the pure article and upon the reputation of creamery and dairy butter, and have adopted restrictive laws to protect the public and dairymen, as well, from the deception attempted thereby. This legislation is based upon the principle that the action of the manufacturers and dealers in oleomargarine in attempting to palm off their counterfeit product as the genuine article is a fraud upon the producers of pure butter and also on the public who seek to buy pure butter, and it is its purpose to prevent such fraud.

These statutes provide penalties for violation of their provisions. They form a part of the criminal laws of the States. It seems that in many of the States the penalties are not as severe as they ought to be. Whether this be the fact or not, it is well known that these laws are constantly being violated with impunity.

In some of the States these laws are openly violated; in others in a clandestine manner.

In Illinois and some of the other States where the principal oleomargarine manufactories are located the laws enacted, prohibiting the manufacture and sale of the product when colored in resemblance of pure butter, have been violated with impunity. It has been found very difficult to enforce these laws in the face of the violent and persistent opposition of the manufacturers and dealers in their determination to override their provisions.

This class of legislation has been attacked and every technical defense has been used to defeat its provisions. It was first claimed that these laws were in violation of the Constitution of the United States giving to Congress the power to regulate commerce between States, but it has been held by the Supreme Court of the United States that this clause of the Constitution does not apply to the manufacture of any products within the several States, even though it may be the purpose of the manufacturer to ship them to other States for sale. The manufactured products only come within the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution when they are put in process of transportation. In the case of *Plumley vs. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts* (155 U. S., 461) the Supreme Court of the United States carefully considered and gave a judicial construction to a statute of Massachusetts providing that—

No person by himself or his agents or servants shall render, or manufacture, sell, offer for sale, expose for sale, or have in his possession with intent to sell, any article, product, or compound made wholly or partly out of any fat, oil, oleaginous substance or compound thereof not produced from unadulterated milk or cream from the same, which shall be an imitation of yellow butter produced from unadulterated milk or cream from the same: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit the manufacture or sale of oleomargarine in a separate and distinct form, and in such manner as will advise the consumer of its real character, free from coloration or ingredient that causes it to look like butter.

The Supreme Court held that this clause is not in violation of the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution, and that the State had the right to prohibit the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine and like products when artificially colored to imitate butter made from pure milk or cream. The Supreme Court says in its opinion:

It will be observed that the statute of Massachusetts which is alleged to be repugnant to the commerce clause of the Constitution does not prohibit the manufacture or sale of oleomargarine, but only such as is colored in imi-

tation of yellow butter produced from pure unadulterated milk or cream of such milk. If free from coloration or ingredient that "causes it to look like butter" the right to sell it "in a separate and distinct form and in such manner as will advise the consumer of its real character," is neither restricted nor prohibited. It appears in this case that oleomargarine, in its natural condition, is of a light-yellowish color, and that the article sold by the accused was artificially colored in imitation of yellow butter.

Now, the real object of coloring oleomargarine so as to make it look like genuine butter is that it may appear to be what it is not, and thus induce unwary purchasers who do not closely scrutinize the label upon the packages in which it is contained to buy it as and for butter produced from unadulterated milk or cream from such milk. The suggestion that oleomargarine is artificially colored so as to render it more palatable and attractive can only mean that customers are deluded by such coloration into believing that they are getting genuine butter. If anyone thinks that oleomargarine not artificially colored so as to cause it to look like butter is as palatable or as wholesome for purposes as food as pure butter, he is, as already observed, at liberty under the statutes of Massachusetts to manufacture it in that State or to sell it there in such manner as to inform the customer of its real character. He is only forbidden to practice in such matters a fraud upon the public. The statute seeks to suppress false pretenses and to promote fair dealing in the sale of an article of food. It compels the sale of oleomargarine for what it is to prevent its sale for what it is not.

Can it be that the Constitution of the United States secures to anyone the privilege of manufacturing and selling an article of food in such manner as to induce the mass of the people to believe that they are buying something which in fact is wholly different from that which is offered for sale? Does the freedom of commerce among the States demand a recognition of the right to practice deception upon the public in the sale of any article, even those that may have become the subject of trade in different parts of the country?

The court further says in the same opinion, in quoting from an opinion of the same court in the case of *Dent vs. West Virginia* (129 U. S., 114):

The power of the State to provide for the general welfare of its people authorizes it to prescribe all such regulations as in its judgment will secure or tend to secure them against the consequences of ignorance and incapacity as well as deception and fraud. If there be any subject over which it would seem the States ought to have plenary control, and the power to legislate in respect to which it ought not to be supposed was intended to be surrendered to the General Government, it is the protection of the people against fraud and deception in the sale of food products.

The court further says in the same opinion:

We are of opinion that it is within the power of the State to exclude from its markets any compound manufactured in another State which has been artificially colored or adulterated so as to cause it to look like an article of food in general use, and the sale of which may, by reason of such coloration or adulteration, cheat the general public into purchasing that which they may not intend to buy. The Constitution of the United States does not secure to anyone the privilege of defrauding the public. The deception against which the statutes of Massachusetts is aimed is an offense against society; and the States are all competent to protect their people against such offenses or wrongs as they are to protect them against crimes or wrongs of more serious character.

This decision is based upon the principle that the statute of Massachusetts, which contains provisions similar to the statutes of many of the other States, was enacted for the purpose of protecting its citizens from deception and fraud; and it recognizes the fact that the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, when artificially colored in imitation of pure butter for the purpose of making it appear like butter and to induce its sale as such, is a fraud upon the public which the legislatures of the several States have the right to prohibit by proper legislation.

While the laws of these States prohibiting the sale of oleomargarine when colored in imitation of butter have been sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States as within the power reserved to the several States under the Federal Constitution, they have proven entirely inefficient to accomplish the purpose designed by their enactment.

Legislation of this character having been approved by such a large majority of the people of the nation, acting through their several State legislatures, and it having been demonstrated that a remedy could not be effected through the action of the States proceeding alone, Congress undertook to deal with the question some years ago by passing a law on this subject.

The act of Congress approved August 2, 1886, entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine," imposes a tax on all manufacturers of and wholesale and retail dealers in oleomargarine when "made in imitation of or resemblance of butter, or when so made calculated or intended to be sold as butter."

This act also provides for the payment of a tax of 2 cents per pound on all oleomargarine "manufactured and sold or removed for consumption or use," and further provides that it "shall be packed by the manufacturer thereof in firkins, tubs, or other wooden packages not before used for that purpose, each containing not less than 10 pounds, and marked, stamped, and branded" in accordance with the regulations provided for in said act.

It further provides that retail dealers in oleomargarine must sell only from original packages in quantities not exceeding 10 pounds, and shall pack the oleomargarine sold by them in suitable wooden or paper packages, which shall be marked and branded as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe.

It seems that the revenue officers of the Government have considered their duties performed in relation to the enforcement of this law when the manufacturers paid the required tax, and but

little effort has ever been made to enforce the provisions of the law in relation to retail dealers.

Investigations made by the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives show that this law has been quite generally observed so far as the payment of the special tax is concerned, but has been very generally violated by the retail dealers so far as it requires them to "pack the oleomargarine sold by them in suitable wooden or paper packages" and mark and brand such packages as required by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

To strengthen the law so as to make it more effective in carrying out the purposes of its enactment and to secure a better observance of it, the pending bill has been introduced.

The first section of this bill provides that oleomargarine and similar products colored in imitation of pure butter, not made of pure milk or cream, transported into any State or Territory shall "be subject to the operation and effect of the laws of such State or Territory to the same extent and in the same manner as though such articles or substances had been produced in such State or Territory." This section proposes to extend to the several States the same power of control as a police regulation over oleomargarine when transported from one State or Territory into another, on its arrival at the place of consignment, as though it had been produced in such State or Territory.

That such legislation is, under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution, within the powers conferred upon Congress is clearly held by the Supreme Court of the United States in the cases of *In re Rahrer* (140 U. S., 514) and *Vance vs. Vandercook & Co.* (170 U. S., 438), construing a similar act of Congress, declaring that intoxicating liquors transported into any State or Territory shall be subject to the operation and effect of the laws of such State or Territory to the same extent and in the same manner as though they had been produced in such State or Territory.

The laws of the several States prohibiting such artificial coloring of oleomargarine have been generally violated by manufacturers and dealers in that article, and owing to the fact that oleomargarine is principally manufactured in a few centers and from there transported into the several States for sale and consumption, it has been found that the enforcement of these laws is next to impossible. To overcome this difficulty and to confine the trade in oleomargarine to its legitimate field, resting upon its own merits and reputation, the second section of the pending bill has been incorporated.

This section provides that a tax shall be paid of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound on oleomargarine manufactured when the same is not colored in imitation of butter; but when the same is colored in imitation of butter the tax paid by the manufacturer shall be 10 cents per pound. This section does not attempt to interfere with or limit the manufacture of oleomargarine when manufactured and sold as such, without coloring to imitate butter.

The manifest purpose of this bill is to secure the cooperation of the State and Federal authorities to prevent the fraudulent manufacture and dealing in oleomargarine; to protect the public, who desire a pure article of butter, as well as the butter makers against fraud and deception, and to require that oleomargarine, when placed on the market, stand on its own merits as oleomargarine and not on the reputation of pure butter.

Under the construction of the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution, as announced in the case of *Plumley vs. The State of Massachusetts*, the States now have the authority to prohibit absolutely the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine when colored to resemble pure butter.

Under the authority reserved to the States by the Constitution, they have plenary power to deal with the question of the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine within their respective jurisdictions when it does not affect the commerce of this article between the several States or with foreign nations.

Oleomargarine is a much cheaper article and can be produced at a much less cost and put upon the market at a much less price than genuine dairy and creamery butter. The object of this section is to adopt this as a revenue measure by the General Government, and as an incident to this measure to prevent the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine when artificially colored in imitation of butter or to place such a tax upon it that when placed upon the market the actual cost of doing so to the producer will be as great, or nearly as great, as the cost of making or manufacturing and placing upon the market pure butter; or, to state the proposition in other words, it proposes to require the oleomargarine manufacturer or dealer to pay a tax on oleomargarine colored as butter large enough to raise the expense to the producer equal to the expense of producing pure butter or to rely for a sale of his product upon its actual merits without deception or fraud in artificially coloring it to resemble pure butter and then selling it on the market as such.

If the bill now pending becomes a law, it will leave the oleomargarine dealer and manufacturer the right and privilege of manufacturing and selling their product upon the market without

restriction, except the payment of a tax of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound; and all those who desire or prefer to use oleomargarine instead of pure butter, because they may think it better or cheaper than butter, will have the opportunity of buying it at its real and actual value and price. The oleomargarine in its natural color is as palatable and as healthful as a food product, and it may be as handsome in appearance as genuine yellow butter, but when it does not have the coloring the opportunities for deceiving the public and realizing the profits by reason of the reputation of creamery butter are removed. The proposition that this is a proper subject of legislation in the interests of honest and legitimate trade, so far as applies to dairymen and butter makers and also to the public who desire to use dairy products, can hardly be controverted.

It is claimed by those who oppose this bill that the manufacture of oleomargarine has grown to be a great industry, and that, if this bill becomes a law, it will materially affect this industry and impair the large capital invested in the oleomargarine business and throw many people engaged in that business out of employment. If we admit this to be true, it presents no argument against the bill, but rather sustains the proposition that the bill ought to be passed. There is nothing in the bill that imposes any restriction on the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine with its natural color, except the tax of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound, and to this tax there seems to be but little objection. If the only objections made to the bill were confined to this provision, speaking for myself alone, I should be willing to see this provision stricken out.

Under the second section of this bill the manufacturer of oleomargarine, with the exception of the small tax imposed, has the same freedom to manufacture and put his product on the market as and for oleomargarine as the dairymen has to put his product on the market as and for pure butter. But this is not what the oleomargarine manufacturer wants. He wants to put his product on the market without restriction, not as oleomargarine, but as and for genuine dairy or creamery butter; and his objection to the bill arises from the fact that it requires him to pay the tax of 10 cents per pound when it is colored in resemblance of butter, and in this way raises the expense of putting his product on the market up to the price of creamery butter. This removes the opportunity for large profits. The butter dealer sells his product for what butter is actually worth on the market. The oleomargarine dealer wants the privilege of selling his, not for what it is actually worth on the market as oleomargarine, but for the price that butter brings on the market. The fact is, there is not now and never has been a market price, open and public, for oleomargarine between dealers and consumers. It has never been put on open market as oleomargarine. The evidence taken before the committees of Congress plainly establish the fact that it would not find purchasers if offered for sale as oleomargarine. It is therefore put on the market as butter and at butter prices.

It is further urged that oleomargarine is a healthful food product and can be produced much cheaper than butter and that those who desire to buy the cheaper article ought to be permitted to do so. We may admit this to be true. But the fact remains that the pending bill does not attempt to impose restrictions on the manufacture or sale of oleomargarine as such, but on the contrary it requires that it be designated as a distinctive product, so that those who desire it may have the genuine article, without coloring to resemble butter, at oleomargarine prices. If uncolored, all chance of deception and fraud is removed, and the party who wants to buy the stuff at its actual value will have the privilege of doing so and will get a cheaper food product for what it is worth; but when colored to resemble butter, and sold as butter, he must pay butter prices. Oleomargarine colored in resemblance of butter is not sold at oleomargarine prices, because that would disclose its identity and destroy the demand for it as a butter.

It is the policy of the Government to secure manufacturers, dealers, and traders in their right to trade-marks adopted or used by them as descriptive of their business or trade or to identify or distinguish their goods or products. They acquire a property right in them, and through them the people are able to identify and distinguish the things bearing these marks from other things of a like character offered to the public by others.

As a matter of business ethics the same principle ought to apply as between the manufacturers and dealers in pure butter and oleomargarine not only to prevent deception and fraud on the public, but also for the protection of the butter makers and dealers, who have built up a great industry and have established an open market that ought not to be invaded by the free introduction of spurious compounds, artificially colored so as to resemble the genuine product so nearly that the public in buying are unable to detect the deception or distinguish the counterfeit from pure butter.

In the minority report of the Committee on Agriculture, after submitting "testimony" which it is claimed "established beyond

controversy that oleomargarine is a nutritious and wholesome article of food," it goes on to say:

The only just complaint (indeed, the only complaint) against the existing oleomargarine law consists in the facility with which the retail dealers, in selling from the original or wholesale package and substituting a new and non-marked wrapper, may violate the law. There is nothing in H. R. 3717 (known as the Grout bill) which would decrease the temptation or increase the difficulty of such violations. On the contrary, the increased taxation would either be fraudulently evaded or else would force the honest manufacturer out of business.

Why would "the increased taxation" be "either fraudulently evaded or else force the honest manufacturer out of business?" The bill is not intended to be a protection to rogues who aim to palm off their spurious article on the public as and for pure butter and on the reputation that butter makers have acquired for their genuine product. To place oleomargarine, artificially colored in resemblance of butter, on the market as and for pure butter is a fraud, both on the public and on the dairymen and creamery men as well. The chief purpose of the bill before the House is to prevent the perpetration of such fraud. It is to make the oleomargarine manufacturer and dealer act honestly in the production and sale of their product.

From the evidence of oleomargarine makers and dealers taken before the Senate and House committees it is made plainly to appear that oleomargarine is put on the market and sold, not as oleomargarine, but as pure butter, and that if put on the market and offered for sale as and for oleomargarine it could not be sold. This is admitted by the dealers in that article themselves. Under the simple habits of our people of years ago this kind of dealing was characterized as fraudulent; but under some of our more modern methods of business and our modern teachings in business ethics, as we have heard them analyzed on the floor of this House, this is thought to be only a modernization of the moral code of business principles. But we still confidently maintain that now, as well as heretofore, deception in business methods constitutes a fraud within the purview of morals which it is the province of the law to prevent.

But we are told in the minority report that if the bill becomes a law one of two things would follow: "The increased taxation would be fraudulently evaded or else it would force the honest manufacturer out of business." Or, to put it in other words, the honest manufacturer who would put his product on the market for what it is, without deception or fraud, and not for what it is not, will be forced "out of business." Then, if we assume that the position of the minority of the committee is correct, there is no way by which an honest man can continue in the oleomargarine business whether the bill before the House becomes a law or not, because the oleomargarine manufacturer can only find a market for his product when colored in imitation of butter and offered for sale as butter. The opponents of the bill now plead for this one privilege—in the interests of morality and fair dealing of course—to be permitted to go on without hindrance and practice this little deception and fraud on the public, because if compelled to be honest they will be driven out of business.

This deception has been practiced so largely that a great industry has been built up by reason of it at the expense and on the reputation of another industry, so that it is now urgent that it would be a great injustice to make them deal honestly in conducting such business.

I can hardly see the logic of the argument.

The minority of the Committee on Agriculture conclude their report by saying:

They beg to assure the House and the country in the most solemn manner possible that it has been their earnest intention, and is now their determination, to do everything possible to be done to enforce the sale of oleomargarine as oleomargarine and to prevent its sale as butter, to prevent fraud and not to stamp out an industry has been our purpose.

It is not our purpose to criticize or question the motives of the minority of the committee, but it does seem that the only practicable way to accomplish "their earnest intention * * * and their determination" is to strike at the root of the evil to be remedied by removing as far as possible the cause and motive for fraud and deception, or make it as hard or inconvenient as possible to commit such fraud and deception. That can only be done by prohibiting entirely the artificial coloring of oleomargarine in resemblance of butter, or place a tax on the colored article in such an amount as will bring the cost up to something near the price of pure butter and admit the uncolored product, where deception can not be practiced, to the markets with as little restriction as possible.

If it be the purpose of those on the floor of this House who support the recommendation of the minority report, "to do everything possible to be done to enforce the sale of oleomargarine as oleomargarine, to prevent its sale as butter, to prevent fraud," why not remove the inducements and opportunities for the commission of fraud and deception? Let us take away the inducement for the commission of such fraud by placing a tax on the product colored in resemblance of butter so as to make its cost to the producer somewhere near the cost of producing pure butter,

or take away the opportunity for committing such frauds by requiring that it shall not be artificially colored to resemble butter, so that those who may desire to purchase may know, from inspection, what they are buying.

This is not imposing any unreasonable restriction on the oleomargarine manufacturer or dealer. It only requires him to be honest; and the fact that if oleomargarine manufacturers are required to be honest it might force them out of business—as seems to be indicated by the minority report of the Committee on Agriculture—this can hardly be recognized as a sufficient reason why the pending bill should not be passed. It is wholesome, and sometimes for the good of the country, that legislation should proceed on such lines as to inculcate lessons of honesty, integrity, and fair dealing.

The cry against the pending bill is the echo of the oleomargarine manufacturers and dealers pleading for immunity in the practice of fraud and deception. They have disregarded the State laws on this subject. They have succeeded in evading the provisions of the existing Federal law almost with impunity, and are now opposing the pending measure because they see in it provisions that may prove stronger in securing its observance.

Section 2 of the substitute for the bill now before the House, as reported by the minority of the committee, provides—

That all oleomargarine shall be put up by the manufacturer for sale in packages of 1 and 2 pounds, respectively, and in no other or larger or smaller package; and upon every print, brick, roll, or lump of oleomargarine, before being so put up for sale or removal from the factory, there shall be impressed by the manufacturer the word "oleomargarine" in sunken letters, the size of which shall be prescribed by regulations made by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury; that every such print, brick, roll, or lump of oleomargarine shall first be wrapped with paper wrapper with the word "oleomargarine" printed thereon in distinct letters, and said wrapper shall also bear the name of the manufacturer, and shall then be put by the manufacturer thereof in such wooden or paper packages or in such wrappers and marked, stamped, and branded with the word "oleomargarine" printed thereon in distinct letters, and in such manner as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe, and the internal-revenue stamp shall be affixed so as to surround the outer wrapper of each 1 and 2 pound package: *Provided*, That any number of such original stamped packages may be put up by the manufacturer in crates or boxes, on the outside of which shall be marked the word "oleomargarine," with such other marks and brands as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall, by regulations approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, prescribe.

Retail dealers in oleomargarine shall sell only the original package to which the tax-paid stamp is affixed.

Whatever may be the purpose of the minority of the committee in preparing and reporting this substitute, it is quite evident from the language used, that it is an attempt, and would if adopted, result in enabling oleomargarine manufacturers and dealers to evade the principle of law as announced in the case of *Plumley vs. Massachusetts*.

In that case it is held that the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution is not such a limitation on the power of the States as to prevent the legislatures thereof from so legislating as absolutely to prohibit the sale of oleomargarine when colored in resemblance of butter, with the purpose of selling it as such. The substitute is an attempt to define and fix by law an "original package" of commerce on which the tax shall be paid and in which form it may be sold by the "retail dealers" under the protection of the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution, and removed from the control of State law.

It is a carefully devised plan to place the sale of oleomargarine, when transported from one State into another, under the protection of the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution and to remove it from the operation of State control.

Whether, under the principles announced in the case of *Plumley vs. Massachusetts*, the substitute would have that effect, is not clear.

These "original package" cases, commencing with *Leisey vs. Hardin* (135 U. S., 100), have all been decided by a divided court; and what the action of that court would be in defining the power of the States in regulating or prohibiting the sale of oleomargarine, colored in resemblance of butter, when put up and offered for sale in packages clearly authorized and defined by Congress as "original packages" and prepared for sale and commerce in that form, under an act of Congress, is yet uncertain.

With the diversity of opinion among the members of that court on these important questions, it yet remains to be determined how far the power of the States will be held to extend in controlling or prohibiting the sale of colored oleomargarine when put up in packages, as provided for in the minority substitute for the bill, if it were to become a law.

It would certainly present a question that was not determined in the case of *Plumley vs. Massachusetts*.

We object to the substitute because it seeks to give to the oleomargarine dealers even greater opportunity to evade and override the laws of the several States on this subject than they have under existing laws.

Under the substitute for the bill the retail dealers would have the same motives for violating and evading the law as they have under the law as it now exists. The packages proposed by the

substitute are to be put up by the manufacturers and by them marked and stamped, and they are required to pay the tax imposed, and when that is done, like the law as it now stands, the interests of the Government are secured, and there will be no further motive under such law for the officers of the Government whose duty it is to see that the provisions of the law are enforced to follow up these packages into the hands of the consumer than there is under the present law. The present law requires the manufacturer to put up the oleomargarine offered for sale by him in packages of not less than 10 pounds, and it requires the retail dealer to sell only from these packages and to put up the article sold by him in paper or wooden packages properly stamped and marked as required by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue; but, as has been clearly demonstrated, this part of the law has been violated almost with impunity.

Experience under the old law has taught us that the only way to secure an observance of the law and to require dealers in oleomargarine to sell it as such, and not as butter, is to remove the opportunities for counterfeiting the article or to place such a tax upon it as to take away the motive for so doing. This is the purpose of the pending bill, and nothing less or short of the provisions of that bill will accomplish the desired end.

We therefore urge, with absolute confidence in the justice of our position, that the substitute presented by the minority of the committee should be defeated and that the bill as reported by the committee should be adopted.

The Grout Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY C. SMITH,

OF MICHIGAN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 7, 1900.

On the bill (H. R. 3717) to make oleomargarine and other imitation dairy products subject to the laws of the State or Territory into which they are transported, and to change the tax on oleomargarine.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I most earnestly support the Grout bill. The bill is just to all interests. The object of the bill is to discourage the production and sale only of such oleomargarine as is colored in semblance of butter, in conflict with the laws of thirty-two States in the Union and in opposition to the sentiment of three-fourths of the people of the United States. Public opinion has declared in favor of honesty and fair dealing and against fraudulent practices.

This is sought to be accomplished by requiring the payment of 10 cents per pound of internal revenue upon oleomargarine colored to resemble butter, and by reducing such revenue on that not so colored from the present rate of 2 cents per pound to one-quarter of a cent per pound. This will aid and assist the manufacturers of the product who care to sell their article on its merits, honestly and fairly, under its own natural color. If their purpose be just, they should be satisfied with this law.

Every article of food that goes out upon the sea of commerce is fairly dealt with when it is permitted to sail, unchallenged, under its own flag—under its own color.

The principles of this law are older than the legislation of the States, older than the Constitution, older than the Congress, older than the Magna Charta. They are as old as justice, as old as our civilization.

This principle was handed down to us on tables of stone, handed down from the mountain top by the first great lawgiver: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

Again, "If thy son shall ask for a fish, will ye give him a serpent? if he shall ask for bread, will ye give him a stone?" If he ask for butter, will ye give him oleomargarine? if he ask for the cow, will ye give him the chemist?

But we are told that farmers color butter yellow. They color butter to look like real, natural butter. They give it the color the cow gives it, the color stained by the pigments of nature, not the colors of the compounding apothecary. If they colored it to look like oleomargarine, this would be a fraud upon the manufacturers of that product, in which case they ought to be restrained.

The farmer is honest and wants not to sail under the black flag of the pirate, and he asks that these pirates of trade shall not plunder under the protection of the Stars and the Stripes in defiance of the statutes of the States.

The farmer is honest and asks that others shall compete with him and only on the same plane. That is all; nothing more; and he will be satisfied with nothing less. He lives near the bosom of

nature and breathes her honesty. He lives with the trees that change not; with the rocks and hills, ever true. Nature is honest. Nature is true. The colors in the grasses never run. The ribbons in the grasses never fade. Babbling brooks are always current. The gold on the ripened grain is never counterfeit. The diamond in the dewdrop is ever genuine. The leaves and the trees give him the music of purity. He lives in nature's cathedral, 'mid the songs of birds and the fragrance of flowers. And he is good, and true, and just. From creation's dawn to now the honest farmer has ever been the pride and glory of the world. He is to-day the best hope of this Republic. He is in possession of the world's largest and best business, and he ought to be protected.

The moral side of this question is the most important one. The history of civilization instructs us that when the minds of the people are entirely given over to gold and to silver, to trading and getting gain, that then the nation of that people is in peril. Honest purpose will win in every race of life. The trouble is this: Oleomargarine must be kept on the ice; kept in the refrigerator. When it melts it separates, is unseemly to the sight. The whole nature rebels against it; it is sickening to behold.

Butter is kept in the same ice box. The temptation is too strong. Weak nature can not resist the temptation. Here lie, side by side, butter and oleomargarine. The price is 28 cents per pound. One costs the merchant 5 cents, the other 24. The customer has no means of distinguishing between the two; he stands between the merchant's honesty and his cupidity. Honesty will many times go down. After the first time the sin grows easier, and to-day we find some merchants, hotels, and restaurant keepers fighting with the manufacturers of this fraud for the privilege to swindle. Be it said to the praise of our civilization, they are few.

We are told that science justifies the use of oleomargarine. We need only to consult our experience. Doctors' opinions are often for sale; knocked down to the highest bidder; on the universal bargain counter, for barter and sale in the department store of our modern life.

Only yesterday I was reading the opinion of a learned scientist that physical exercise was harmful to health—a crumb of comfort to the indolent. Within a year another learned scientist stated and proved that a certain quantity (and quite a large amount, too) of alcoholic liquor was absolutely necessary to good health—a very comfortable theory to all good fellows who get thirsty at 5 a. m. Every whisky vender sends out the opinion with his prospectus. Many nice and agreeable things are made comfortable for us these days.

If their compound is really pure, good, and all right, why the resisted and stubborn fight in this House last spring against spreading upon the record here and laying before the public an analysis of what we are made to eat when we want butter? "By their fruits ye shall know them."

There should be made no objection to this compound meeting competition on the markets upon its merit. It has always been the policy of the civilized world that food stuffs should be pure and wholesome. In the law there is an implied warranty that all articles of food, without word or hint of warranty, are warranted to be pure and wholesome.

I want to go further. Every article of commerce, whether of food product or not, should be sold only under its own proper name and description. To sell food or anything else otherwise is a fraud upon the public and should not be for one moment tolerated, even when no question of health is involved. When money is exchanged for anything, the purchaser has the undoubted right to get what he wants, what he asks for, and what he pays for. The purchaser has the right to know what food he buys—the contents thereof.

If their article will sell on the merits thereof, if the people really want it, care for it, strive for it, ask for it, buy it, understanding what they are buying, then why should the vendors of the product go to the expense of advertising it as butter, "pure grass butter, pure dairy butter, pure Elgin creamery, Rock River creamery," and such like frauds and deceptions?

In my district it is Lotus butter, Monroe creamery, and other well-known brands of good, pure butter. Such conduct is a confession that the people do not want oleomargarine; that they will not buy it as such—that they must be deceived and tricked into using it. The eye may be deceived; the taste, too; but still it is deception and fraud and wrong.

The evidence is that these manufacturers of oleomargarine encourage their customers to advertise their product as pure dairy cow butter, grass dairy butter, mother's rolls, lowering the high standard of womanhood to get gain. A libel upon the mothers! They also advise their clients to buy and sell their wares, and they will fight the State laws, will protect them in lawbreaking, help them to set the laws of the States at defiance. Let us stretch forth the strong Federal arm of the law to the assistance of the States and curb the greed of these bold defiers of authority.

This law does not go far enough, but it will help some. It is probably as strong as could now be passed. It will at least curb the business, cut down the profits, and lessen the power to advertise, deceive, and swindle. Let us do our duty manfully. Let us vote for purity and honesty and against fraud and wrong.

The first section of the bill in substance provides that all articles known as oleomargarine, butterine, imitation butter, or imitation cheese, or any substance in the semblance of butter or cheese, not the usual product of the dairy and not made exclusively of pure and unadulterated milk or cream, which shall be transported into any State or Territory and remain there for use, sale, or storage, shall upon arrival within such State or Territory be subject to the laws of such State or Territory.

If enacted this law would reach, affect, and control real butter which is colored yellow which is not made exclusively and entirely of pure and unadulterated cream or milk and which is not the usual product of the dairy.

This part of the law is general in its application and reaches, affects, and controls the farmer and dairyman who colors his butter or cheese yellow, or who attempts to put upon the market any butter or cheese not exclusively made of pure and unadulterated milk or cream.

The second clause of the section assists the laws of the several States—simply lends the Federal arm of the law to assist the enactments of the several States.

I can not better close my remarks than with a quotation from Judge Harlan, of the Supreme Court of the United States, in *Plumley vs. Massachusetts*.

These are his strong and ringing words:

And yet it is supposed the owners of a compound which has been put in a condition to cheat the public into believing it is a particular article of food in daily use and eagerly sought for by people in every condition of life are protected by the Constitution in making a sale of it against the will of the States in which it is offered for sale because of the circumstance that it is in an original package and has become a subject of ordinary traffic. We are unwilling to accept this view. We are of the opinion that it is within the power of a State to exclude from its markets any compound manufactured in another State which has been artificially colored or adulterated so as to cause it to look like an article of food in general use, and the sale of which may, by reason of such coloration or adulteration, cheat the general public into purchasing that which they may not intend to buy.

The Constitution of the United States does not secure to anyone the privilege of defrauding the public. The deception against which the statute of Massachusetts is aimed is an offense against society; the States are as competent to protect their people against such offenses or wrongs as they are to protect them against crimes or wrongs of more serious character. And this protection may be given without violating any right secured by the national Constitution, and without infringing the authority of the General Government. A State enactment forbidding the sale of deceitful imitations of articles of food in general use among the people does not abridge any privilege secured to citizens of the United States, nor in any just sense interfere with the freedom of commerce among the several States.

Army Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY S. BOUTELL,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, December 6, 1900.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 4300) to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States, and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. LITTLEFIELD) having offered the following amendment:

Amend by striking out section 40 of the bill and inserting in lieu thereof the following section:

"Sec. 40. The sale of or dealing in beer, wine, or other intoxicating liquors by any person in any post exchange, or canteen, or army transport, or upon any premises used for military purposes by the United States, is hereby prohibited. The Secretary of War is hereby directed to carry the provisions of this section into full force and effect."

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: From my own observation, from the testimony of a great majority of the officers of the Army, and from such evidence as I have gathered from interviews with men in the ranks, I am led to the conviction that this amendment, if carried into effect, would not produce the results that the advocates of the measure expect and desire. The abolition of the Army canteen will not remove from those who are incapable of self-restraint either the opportunity or the temptation to drink to excess.

As we all know, every camp, every Army post in this country and in foreign lands is surrounded by drinking resorts, some of them of the lowest character, where impure liquors are sold at exorbitant prices and in which those who frequent them are surrounded by evils infinitely worse than the temptation to intemperance. On the other hand, the canteen offers no inducement and no encouragement to vice. Provisions, light wines, and beers are sold at the post exchange at reasonable rates and under strict supervision. No spirits or other strong liquors are allowed to be sold.

Now, we have heard a good deal about the opinions of Army officers respecting the canteen, and we have received advice and suggestions on this subject from many who have never even visited an Army post or seen anything of Army life. In my opinion, we ought to get at the views and the wishes of the private soldiers in this matter.

The post exchange is the soldiers' club. Here he finds harmless recreation, and in the simple refreshments that he is able to buy he is permitted to vary the monotony of army life.

A soldier's life is at best a rough one, and Army rations are almost unendurably monotonous.

Let us not by the abolition of the canteen make the lives of our soldiers still more barren and unattractive than they are at present.

But there is a still more serious objection to this amendment. It is an unwarranted attack upon the personal liberty of men who are better able to take care of themselves than any other class of people. Self-control, good order, and discipline are the foundation stones of military service, and very few soldiers are found guilty of abusing the privileges afforded by the post exchange.

The soldier who enjoys his pipe and his glass of beer at the post exchange takes his recreation and amusement under the restraining influences of an orderly environment and in the company of familiar associates whom he respects and who respect him. Abolish the canteen and you will drive many soldiers into evil and disorderly surroundings and among strange and contaminating associates. If this amendment should become a law, I am confident that the evils resulting from its passage would be so great that within a year we would be besieged from all sides to repeal it.

For these reasons, and especially because it is an uncalled-for infringement upon the personal rights and liberties of the great body of well-disciplined, self-respecting, and honorable men who compose the rank and file of our Army, this amendment fails to commend itself to my judgment and I shall vote against it.

Army Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. B. T. CLAYTON,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, December 6, 1900.

On the bill (S. 4300) to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York said:

Mr. SPEAKER: In the consideration of this bill it is generally assumed that provision must be made for retaining troops in the Philippine Islands for some years to come. The exact length of time is a question upon which we differ, and which no man can answer with certainty. The election to office for four years more of the present Administration must be admitted as an endorsement of the present policy. Before election it was well that there existed a wide difference of opinion as to the policy that should be pursued. Men who opposed from sincere conviction the permanent retention of these islands contrary to our past experience and past history were as patriotic in their motives as those who advocated keeping them because of a belief that by such a course they would add to the greatness and glory of this Republic; but now that the election is over there arises only the question of ways and means of carrying out in the most economical and effective way what has been decided upon by the people.

The verdict of the people to continue the present policy makes it difficult to further question the obligations of Congress to provide the large force in these islands which two years' experience shows to be necessary. Whatever may be the ultimate disposition of them, whatever may be the form of the permanent government to be established there, to-day there is no question as to our obligation to complete what has been undertaken by the President and sanctioned by the people and to establish peace and order and stable government throughout the archipelago. Judging from careful consideration of the conditions as set forth in the daily press and in public documents, as well as in many private letters which I have received from a large number of officers and friends now in the islands, and whom I know to be conservative and truthful, I am convinced that a large body of troops will be needed there for a great many years.

Without going into detail, the facts are that our authority has been extended over some 8,000,000 of semisavage people, talking various languages, divided into different tribes, having various forms of government and different customs and methods of living. There is a widespread hatred and suspicion of everything

American. Harmonious union into one orderly government is a new idea to them and will take time to accomplish. Our strength alone has been demonstrated to these people. It remains now to demonstrate our justice, our fairness, and the advantage to them of good government, modern methods, and the use throughout the islands of the American language. If we are to accomplish these objects—and I take it that the American people so decided by the last election—I am fully convinced that a large force of troops must be maintained in the islands for some years to come.

Admitting this necessity, of which there is no doubt in my mind, it is now, in view of the limitations put upon the length of service of the present army of occupation when it was organized, our evident duty to provide another force to take its place. In accomplishing this it seems to me that business principles and patriotic endeavor should supersede political considerations. The army to be organized should be the one most effective as a fighting machine, most reliable in extending and maintaining law and order and civil government, and should be most loyal and subordinate to the laws and wishes of the Government and people of the United States, and should be organized with a view to the greatest economy in men and money. The officers to be intrusted with the execution of this mission should have permanent positions and their status and promotion fixed by law, and thus be relieved as far as possible from the temptation to use their positions for private gain or advancement.

This country is justly proud of her volunteer soldiers. The safety of the Government and the strength of the nation must ever rest upon the patriotism, intelligence, and fighting qualities of the great body of young men whose vocations are those of peace and industry, but who ever stand ready to answer the call of their country if need be; but the business before us now is to furnish a force that must be sent to the other side of the world for a service the end of which no man can foresee. It is not sufficient that we theorize and regret the necessity. It is time now that we meet the question practically and furnish the force which our experience tells us will give the best results.

Some of my colleagues are opposed to the measure because it makes a Regular Army take the place of a Volunteer Army. I do not see the validity of this argument under the present circumstances, because the force to be organized is to be used to carry out a work that is sure to last for a great many years, and the conditions are not such as would justify the Government in asking a man of family or a man established in civil life to sacrifice his time and his prospects of advancement in his ordinary vocation to enter such a service. The service required is not such as properly belongs to volunteers. The service required of our Army in that country is in many respects similar to the service required of our Army in former years upon our Western frontier. I do not mean to say that the Filipinos are like our Indians, but the service required of our troops will be very much like that required of our Army in our own Western country so many years; and it is not good policy to be repeatedly sending an army under a temporary organization to be performing continuous work. It would be neither fair to the officers and men nor to the Government.

Any man who is fit to be intrusted with the responsibility that must devolve upon our officers out there should be relieved from the sacrifices of leaving his home and his business to undertake such arduous duty in a tropical country with a commission that lasts only two years. There is no necessity for such sacrifices, because every reasonable man must know that the work will not be completed at the end of two years; and if a two-year army were organized, another army must be organized at the end of that time to take its place. Only those men should be enlisted who answer to the qualifications required for the regular service. Men who have families or relations dependent upon them should not be enlisted. Only such men as can and would look upon their company as their home should be accepted for this service. Justice to the individual and efficiency in the Government service require these restrictions. Officers who hold commissions which will last for life or during good behavior will be relieved from many temptations that would beset men holding commissions which they know will terminate at the end of two years. And the power and immense pecuniary and property responsibility to be intrusted to this army makes it important that we should safeguard the service in every way possible.

The bill now under consideration is intended to meet the present emergency by establishing an army of about 100,000 men. It is generally admitted that a force less than this would not be sufficient for the present needs. Section 31 of the bill provides the manner in which this force may be reduced to about 58,000 men as soon as the exigencies of the service will admit. It may therefore be considered as a bill authorizing a force of 100,000 men with the declared policy of reduction to 58,000 men when the future necessities of the service will admit; and in view of the greater efficiency and economy, its adoption seems to me to be a wiser course than that of reorganizing and fixing our Regular Army at 60,000 and providing an additional temporary force to meet the

present necessity. The bill has been carefully drawn and as a reorganization measure will work a number of important and advantageous changes.

The increase in the cavalry in greater proportion than in the infantry is one demanded by the impossibility of quickly organizing a temporary efficient cavalry force. The cavalry have demonstrated their ability not only by campaigning in the United States, but by campaigning in the insular possessions now under the United States. Their rapidity of movement reduces the number of troops which would be required in case reliance were placed entirely upon infantry.

The reorganization of the artillery places that corps on a basis for securing efficiency with the greatest economy in the number of troops by giving a flexible organization which will prevent useless troops being kept at any point which in a regimental organization would have to be done unless the regimental organization is temporarily formed. For instance, it allows the assignment to Fort Hamilton or Fort Wadsworth of just the number of batteries required by the armament of the post without regard to the regimental formation, which would require twelve batteries to be under command of one colonel.

It places the submarine mines and torpedo defenses and fixable and movable elements on land and seacoast fortifications by law under the charge of the very troops organized for the purpose of seacoast defenses. It provides that the increase in the artillery shall be gradual, thus avoiding the appointment of officers and men to any grade without being competent for the special duties required by modern scientific appliances in seacoast service. It offers some pecuniary incentive to enlisted men to qualify themselves as first or second class gunners. It is a well-known principle that such incentive is desirable in order to secure increased efficiency. In providing for the reduction and again for the increase in the artillery, infantry, and cavalry, as the exigencies may require, the military principle is recognized that an existing unit may be increased by one-third of its original force without destroying its efficiency. When the Spanish war began the seacoast defenses were increased from about 60 enlisted men to 200, resulting in the destruction of efficiency which has taken months to overcome. Now the efficient military unit can not be indefinitely enlarged, but the existing unit may be increased by adding one-half the number of its reduced size without material sacrifice of efficiency.

The provisions of this bill, which permit the detail of line officers to the lower grades of the staff departments, must result in bringing the line and staff of the Army in closer sympathy and bringing to the aid of the staff departments men whose military training and natural ability cause them to be well fitted to intelligently perform the staff duties, and at the same time allows their immediate return to the line if they show themselves unable to cope with their new duties. If this system of temporary details proves to be as beneficial as its advocates believe it will, we will then have a basis for extension of that system throughout the staff departments based on actual experience. This system of temporary detail for the junior grades has already been in satisfactory operation in one staff department—that of the Judge-Advocate-General. The chief of that department is on record as desiring its continuance, due to the good results which have obtained in his corps.

There have been added to the bill as amendments on the floor of this House certain provisions which I can not approve, but on the whole the bill as reported by the committee has so many good features that I intend to give it my vote on its merits.

Army Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. D. BOWERSOCK.

OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, December 6, 1900.

On the bill (S. 4300) to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States.

Mr. BOWERSOCK said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I am interested in this anti-canteen amendment because I believe it to be right. I am not one of those who look to law to make men good, or who believes that man must walk in the path I mark out for him in order to be virtuous and happy.

I will make no effort to change human nature and suddenly reform mankind by statutes. I would be conservative, always endeavoring to move toward a higher plane. We can control and

restrain within certain limits; we can avoid a full partnership with evil; we can, and it is better that we should, heed the well-settled desire of the people. The earnest, thoughtful, calm convictions of the people are right, and sooner or later this body must meet these convictions and at least endeavor to give force and effect to them.

I am not here at this time to enter upon a tirade against intemperance or a protest against the manufacture and use of beer and liquor. Good men and true men walk by different paths toward the same goal. I will not now offer lengthy argument upon the evils of the canteen, what it may lead to, or the demoralization it may cause. Civilization has not yet begun the manufacture of pruning knives from swords. Our Government at times needs soldiers and calls for men who may serve temporarily as volunteers and may later enter the regular service. The call is generally responded to with an alacrity and an enthusiasm that brings glory to our land and discomfiture to our enemies. Who respond? The noblest, the strongest, the brightest youth of the nation. We send our boys with all the pride and hope and patriotism and confidence that seems to be the birthright of the American. When these young men go into the Army we know that some may not—will not—return. Climate and exposure will make physical wrecks of too many, and the bullet will too often maim, cripple, disfigure, and kill.

These are accepted as the fortunes of war. But the mothers of these boys ask and plead that the Government place not opportunity and temptation to intemperance, to drunkenness, before their sons in addition to the other evils and dangers that encompass them. They ask—and they have a right to ask—that the Government be not a partner in a traffic of which they disapprove and which they believe is a menace—yea, more, an outrage. And I give you warning: A goodly and respectable number of fathers are of the same opinion and belief.

Congress agreed with these good people not long since, and passed an anti-canteen law. This law was unceremoniously pushed aside. Whether unjustly or not, the people believe unjustly, and think that a subterfuge took the place of reason, and they demand a rehearing and a trial. Is a request made by a few thousand Government employees for a regular vacation, or for more pay, or shorter hours—this body listens and acts. Do half a million old soldiers ask for relief at your hands—they are not turned away empty. They should not be. It is safe to say that a majority of our people want the Government to go out of the canteen business. Provide the reading room, the news room, the billiard room, the place for amusement and recreation, but don't sell the soldier liquor and give as an excuse or palliation that he will get poorer stuff on the outside.

Do you think that this majority of our people will not, sooner or later, secure a reasonable trial of what they propose and ask for? Is there a father that would not prefer—more, insist—that if his son is to have a taste for strong drink and is to be subjected to its influences that it be not chargeable to the Government the young soldier is endeavoring to protect and serve?

I know that a large number of Army officers have put themselves on record as favoring the canteen. Some are on record on both sides. I desire to call attention to the opinions and observations of a few worthy officers of our Army as to this question:

HEADQUARTERS FIFTH ARMY CORPS,
Santiago de Cuba, July 30, 1898.

*** I have always been strongly opposed to the canteen system or the sale of intoxicating drinks of any kind on military reservations, and have opposed it until absolutely overruled and required to establish a canteen at my post. ***

WILLIAM R. SHAFTER,
Major-General, U. S. Volunteers, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS U. S. FORCES,
Camp Wikoff, Montauk Point, Long Island, September 20, 1898.

*** I am a thorough believer in temperance in all things, and am utterly opposed to soldiers being sold intoxicating liquors, and I believe that every effort should be exercised to remove the temptation of such dissipation from them.

You must recollect that all men are human, and if we can not make everything perfect we must make it as near perfect as possible.

Respectfully,

J. WHEELER,
Major-General, United States Volunteers.

HEADQUARTERS SOUTHWESTERN DISTRICT,
Porto Rico, Ponce, September 15, 1898.

*** I am opposed to sales of liquors of any kind to enlisted men, and the use of the same in hot climates is injurious. A canteen puts liquor (beer and light wines) in front of a man, and induces him to drink, which, with this temptation removed, he would never do.

GUY V. HENRY,
Brigadier-General, United States Volunteers.

HOSPITAL HEADQUARTERS, SEVENTH REGULAR INFANTRY,
Camp Wikoff, Long Island, September 23.

*** What the houses of prostitution are to the youth of the city, so are the canteens of our Army to the soldier.

W. GENELLA,
Regimental Surgeon, Seventh Regular United States Infantry.

HEADQUARTERS FOURTEENTH REGIMENT,
PENNSYLVANIA VOLUNTEER INFANTRY,
Camp Meade, Middletown, Pa., September 23, 1898.

*** There are many ways that a soldier can ruin himself, but I think the canteen is the most damnable of all; I have never allowed one in my regiment, and I never will.

W. J. GLENN,
Colonel, Commanding.

KANSAS CITY, Mo., September 23.

*** I have had good opportunity to observe the effects of beer on the health of the men in the Second Division. I can not say that a limited quantity of beer would have been injurious, but the quantity can not be controlled if canteens are permitted to be open. Many of the regiments found it necessary to close their canteens.

MILO B. WARD,
Major and Surgeon, United States Volunteers.

*** It is particularly important when a large proportion of the troops are recruits that nothing be officially done to create in them any habit of using intoxicants; and this, it is believed, would be the result if, as has been deemed desirable in some portions of the United States, canteens be established in the posts where light wines and beer are regularly furnished. In such circumstances the temptations of sociability and companionship are practically irresistible, and the habit of drinking is readily acquired. (Pages 236, 237, Part I, Report of Major-General Commanding the Army, 1899.)

But opinions of others weigh not so much with me as the broad principle that the Government of the United States should not engage in the liquor business and that the mothers of our soldier boys have a right to a respectful hearing, to an honest and impartial trial of that for which they plead.

Army Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS M. JETT,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, December 6, 1900.

On the bill (S. 4300) to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States.

Mr. JETT said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The bill under consideration has in contemplation two objects, one of which is to reorganize the Army and the other to provide for an Army. During the Fifty-fifth Congress I had occasion to express fully my position upon the question of a large standing army, and were it not for the fact that we have just come out of a great political contest in which the provisions of this bill were in a measure an issue, I would not think of imposing myself upon this body.

It seems that our Republican friends have taken the result of the recent election as an endorsement of the policy of providing for and maintaining a great standing army. It has never heretofore been the policy of this Government to follow in the footsteps of European nations, but it seems that since the present Administration came into power there has been an absolute change of policy inaugurated, and the tendency has been and seems to be now to adopt the policy of foreign nations in many particular which are, in my judgment, opposed to the institutions of a republican form of government. The bill under consideration provides for a standing army of 58,000, and at the same time gives the power and authority to the President of the United States to increase the Army to 100,000, and this Army is to be kept and maintained in time of peace as well as in time of war. It is understood by all that the Army at the present time is to be increased and that this legislation is demanded that the Army may be raised for the purpose of assisting the Administration in carrying out its Philippine policy.

In discussing a bill of this character there are two principal things to be looked to: First, is it well for a republic to keep and maintain a large standing army, and second, the great expense to which the people will be put in keeping and maintaining such an army; that is, the great burdens that will necessarily be thrust upon the people in supporting an army of 100,000 in time of peace as well as in time of war. I for one have always maintained that a great standing army was contrary to the institutions of our form of government; that a great standing army was a menace to a free people, and while I would not say anything disparagingly of the courage of the regular soldier, yet the truth and the fact is that the great battles of this country have been fought and won by the volunteer or citizen soldiery. And at all times when we are engaged in a war in the future it will be, as it has been in the past, that the volunteer soldiery will be called upon to take a hand in the struggles for supremacy notwithstanding the size of our regular Army. One great objection to the present bill is that it is authorizing a regular army of 100,000, whether in peace or in war, and the taxpayers of this country will be com-

pelled to be taxed to support the great army provided for in and by this bill whether in peace or in war.

Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that we appropriated and expended upon the Army for the last fiscal year \$127,000,000; that there has been appropriated for the use of the Army for and during the present fiscal year \$115,000,000, and this is \$13,000,000 short of the estimates furnished by the Secretary of War, which said sum of \$13,000,000 will necessarily have to be appropriated before the end of the present fiscal year, making in all \$128,000,000 that we will have expended upon the Army this year. This is an item that should be taken into consideration by the members upon the other side of this House. This great expense has been brought about in carrying out the Philippine policy of the present Federal Administration. Mr. McKinley and his party associates and party advisers are responsible for this great burden that has been thrust upon the people of this country. One \$100,000,000 of this enormous sum expended, as heretofore stated, has been occasioned by reason of the Philippine policy entered upon by the McKinley Administration.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known by all members of this House that we appropriated for the use of the Army before the Spanish-American war annually \$23,000,000 to \$24,000,000, and now, two years after that war is over, we are appropriating more than \$100,000,000 annually in addition to that sum. This is the business proposition the Republican party has inaugurated; this is the investment that the people have had made for them, and one that the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber think has met with the approval of the people. In this, in my humble judgment, they deceive themselves; upon this particular question I believe, when it is considered in the light of the true facts, and it will finally be, the people will be opposed, and will so record themselves, to the expenditure of so large sums of money in order to carry out the policy entered upon by our Republican friends just to satisfy the whims of the favored few.

Mr. Chairman, this Philippine policy, it is said by the Republican party, must be maintained, and we must keep a large army to maintain such policy for the reason, as they say, to give us a large amount of trade. In this connection I desire to read a statement sent out some time ago from the office of the honorable Secretary of War, Mr. Root:

WASHINGTON, July 8.

The report of the division of the customs and insular affairs, War Department, made public to-day, has an interesting statement showing the total imports at the port of Manila, P. I., for the calendar year 1899.

Merchandise to the value of \$17,450,412 was imported during the year, which, with \$100,935 in gold and \$1,141,392 in silver coin, brings the total importations for 1899 to \$18,701,499. Of this amount \$1,887,000 worth entered free of duty. All imports of merchandise were brought in foreign vessels and entered for immediate consumption. The total amount of import duty collected was \$3,304,000.

The imports by countries show:

From China, \$6,790,769; England, \$3,102,728; Spain, \$2,624,879; United States, \$1,350,364; British East Indies, \$1,219,502.

Can anyone study this report and reach the conclusion that this trade is proving beneficial to us as a people and as a nation? Consider the great expenditures we are compelled to go to and compare them with the volume of business done with the Filipinos as given here and elsewhere, and it will be found that this is a costly investment the Republican party has made for the people. This is the principal part of the entire Philippine group.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that I oppose legislation providing for a strong standing army on principle. I fear it will not prove to be for the best interests of our people. Its tendency has been at all times to intimidate the citizen in the peaceful pursuits of his civil rights, and at the end in many cases has undermined and seriously impaired self-government, if not destroyed it. I am, therefore, Mr. Chairman, obliged, believing as I do, to vote against the pending bill. [Continued applause on Democratic side.]

The Army Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALTER P. BROWNLOW,

OF TENNESSEE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, December 6, 1900.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 4300) to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States—

Mr. BROWNLOW said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The United States is an anomaly in the annals of the world. It is the first venture of human liberty to build and fortify a secure and permanent home. It is unlike any other nation in the spirit, temper, ambition, and aims of its people. It is unlike any other nation in its institutions and operations of

government, which are the outgrowth of hope, courage, intelligence, and an unyielding determination to avoid what is pernicious and degrading and to achieve what is honest, pure, and beneficent. In the complexities of its structure it has no taint of feudalism and no

FEATURES OF MONARCHY.

It has no thirst for conquest and no greed for colonies. The conduct of its internal affairs and the policy of its intercourse with other nations are sanctioned by experience and the special favors of the God of Nations. Its "foundation is liberty; its superstructure is peace."

The bare idea of brute force, the domination of the stronger over the weaker, the exacting and overbearing rule of the baron over the cramped and serving poor, is abhorrent to the severe and keen sense of right and justice which has always distinguished the American people. What they are and what they have they have attained through honest and industrious efforts. They have, only when compelled, resorted to the harsher and sterner measures of armed conflict to maintain their honor and integrity and safeguard their rights and interests and to repel the aggressions of the haughty and the brutal upon the helpless and the suffering. They have established and maintained

DOCTRINES, CUSTOMS, AND SYSTEMS

which infuse and foster a proper spirit of lofty independence and expand liberty into the freest expression of thought and action consistent with the rights of others and the general welfare. The consequence is that we have an untrammelled press, engaging the brightest talent of the land and diffusing intelligence among the masses; we have prophets of every school reading the horoscope of the future to suit themselves and no censorship over their predictions, and priests and apostles and propagandists of every creed and organization who ply their vocation without let or hindrance. Ours is a free, progressive, intelligent, and investigating people, rising above partisan passion and narrow bigotry, probing to the bottom the problems of political philosophy and the subtleties of diplomatic craft, and can never be enslaved, degraded, or

OVERAWED BY THE PRIDE OF POWER,

come in what shape it may.

The people of the United States not only have the learning of the schools and the training of newspaper educators, but the more useful discipline of discrimination and experience. A theory that will not stand the test of practice they throw overboard. They have that kind of an education that reveals the value of their opportunities and the sacredness of their privileges and duties. They do not stand aghast at the recitals of peril and computations of expenditure when their own sagacity tells them that the profit will far exceed the loss. When the question of right has been settled negatively they call a halt, or affirmatively their

COMMAND IS, "GO FORWARD."

Our system of government is the same that came from the wise heads, the honest hearts, and pure hands of the fathers; there has always been an idolatrous regard for the counsels and direction of these sages, and the principles of government, and even the details of its operation have only been amplified to meet the increasing demands of our national growth and expansion. The casket has undergone slight changes, but the precious jewel has been left untouched.

Though some pessimists, veiled and hooded in their own self-conceit and in the gloom of their thoughts, may raise the alarm that

THE NATIONAL CONSCIENCE IS WEAKENING,

patriotism waning, and that there is a gradual and steady decadence of all the elements of our national strength, nothing could be farther from our actual condition. Though in the very blossom of youth, this nation has the buoyant virility of matured years.

You can no more divert it from the trend of its progress nor change the destiny of its commercial and territorial development than you can harness a Caribbean storm. In the activity and diversification of its industries, in the variety and abundance of its productions, and in the generosity, intelligence, civilization, aspiration, and wealth of its people, it leads the world and holds a complete

MASTERY OVER ITS MARKETS.

Its area is almost entirely covered with an embroidery of rail and wire. Its people buy and read newspapers, magazines, periodicals, and books by the billion. The enduring grandeur of its cities surpass the emblazonry of oriental dreams. And, best of all, the most promising of all its features of glory and power is the fact that 17,000,000, or about one-fifth of its population, are enrolled in the public schools. Such forces for national aggrandizement can not be thwarted nor subverted.

Should not a nation such as this, leading the van of the world powers, have a respectable and adequate armament on land and sea? The world makes history rapidly—centuries are crowded into decades and decades into months; from morning's dawn to evening's glow

IS AN EPOCH.

Should not our Government be prepared for emergencies that may be born in a day? Such emergencies have happened in the recent past, and may happen again.

Though we had a goodly number of modern battle ships, "our sharp, short, and decisive conflict" with Spain demonstrated the insufficiency of our naval equipment. We had enough to destroy the fleets of the enemy after we had found them, but not enough to blockade the forts, aid the land forces fighting on the shores, and scour the high seas.

THE GOVERNMENT HEEDED THE WARNING.

recognized the peril, and is enlarging the Navy with a splendid line of modern battle ships that will accord with her supremacy as the leading world power.

Why should not the military arm of the Government be strengthened in like manner? If Aguinaldo is dead, as so often reported, he is certainly a very lively corpse, and his deluded followers in the revolt against the sovereign authority of the United States manifest no inclination to surrender. They throng the jungles, defiles, and passes of the Luzon hills, and at every opportunity murder American soldiers. War on that bloody island is a lengthening chain. Luzon is

AN UNCONQUERED PROVINCE.

and will be as long as the Filipinos possess the power and opportunity to shed American blood.

The ports of entry are ours. The gallant marines under good Admiral Dewey have done their work, and done it surpassingly well. Soldiers are now our need. An emergency frightful in its aspects and terrible in its consequences is before us if this bill for the permanent enlargement of the Regular Army should fail to pass. All that we have achieved will be lost, the fruits of the brilliant victory at Manila will turn to ashes, and the death of every soldier in the Philippines

WILL BECOME A CRIME.

To avert this disaster and disgrace, to relieve an already insufficient army being rapidly decimated by slaughter and disease, to protect the lives and property of the friendly Filipinos who deprecate the revolt, to obtain what is honestly ours and what we have paid for, to uphold the flag where it is planted, and to plant it where it should go, soldiers are needed now for the Philippine service.

Is it too much to hope that our Democratic friends on the other side of this Chamber will sink the partisan in the patriot and abandon all opposition to this righteous and God required measure of relief and their leading campaign war cry that "the empire is coming?" Is it too much to hope that a knowledge of the needs of the country and that a crisis is impending in the Philippines, that the honor of the flag and the integrity and prestige of the country, will lead all to seek the only path of safety and patriotic duty, and each member of this body, foregoing all partisan feeling, will vie with all the rest in

MAINTAINING THE SOVEREIGNTY

of the nation over the archipelago.

The Army bill is not a job. There is no mercenary feature connected with it. It affords no shelter for the Army speculator. It is not a plot to provide fat and safe positions for those "with a pull." It is no scheme to render the Administration more popular or to add new luster to the stars on the Republican flag. It is not a partisan measure. It is not an organized raid on the Treasury. It is every whit clean and pure throughout. It is a hearty and prompt response to a call imperatively urgent. It is just what a large majority of the people by their votes said they demanded. It is the popular will declared and recorded under the solemn sanction of a public duty, and should be regarded

AS THE VOICE OF GOD.

It seems to me, and I do not wish to be offensive, that the member who dallies, falters, hesitates, and refuses to give this measure the weight of his influence and the support of his vote has an obscured conception of what he is here for.

This bill is not covered over with political features, though it has in it for the vanquished compensation for the bitter memories of an overwhelming defeat, whilst it commends itself to the approval and support of every true American as the embodiment of the impulses and sentiments of a

PURE, LOFTY, AND UNSELFISH PATRIOTISM.

The man who opposes it will annihilate his future and make for himself a grave so deep, obscure, and unsuspected that the angel of the resurrection, after reading the epitaph on his tombstone, will refrain from breaking his dreamless slumber.

An exigency confronts us, and we can not thrust it aside as we cast away a rotten orange. We must provide against it and meet it. If we fail or refuse to do so, we attempt to arrest the trend of the world's movement, abandon with contemptible cowardice what we have undertaken in the interest of humanity and civilization, retreat from the line that Providence has marked out for

us to pursue, provoke the scorn and ridicule of all nations, recede from our commanding place in the affairs of the world, and make the flag, glorified by unnumbered victories of peace and war,

A SYMBOL OF DISCREDIT AND INFAMY.

The Government has been forced to embark in enterprises that she can not carry forward to successful completion without a large force of trained soldiery. If this bill, or one similar in its provisions, fails of enactment at this session of Congress the armed forces of the Government will be reduced to 27,000 men the 1st of July next. What a pitiable and disgraceful spectacle that would be! What a commentary it would be on the unconcern, recreancy, and unfaithfulness of the law-making power! What a reckless and indefensible defiance of the

RECORDED WISHES AND DECREES

of a vast majority of the American people! Until the machinery of the courts in Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, or other islands now in our peaceful possession are put in operation and government established, and their people have become familiar and satisfied with its spirit, methods, and purposes, the presence of a considerable armed force will be necessary to insure general acquiescence and security. The complications of the Chinese situation are by no means ended; the door to the East is not yet fully opened, and no one can tell with any satisfying degree of definiteness what the future has in store. The Government of the United States

HAS A POLICY OF ITS OWN,

and should be armed with a plenitude of power to enforce it, and not be "cribbed, confined, and confined" that "a damned spot" on its prestige may follow. The revolt in the archipelago is still flagrant, and if there are not reinforcements after the reduction next July the Tagal bandits, under "the Washington of the Philippines," will swoop down from their hiding places in the jungles and fastnesses of the Luzon hills and butcher at their leisure a decimated and insufficient army.

The fact confronts us that the term of enlistment of 26 regiments of United States troops in the Philippine service expires June 30, 1901, and this depletion must be provided against or we must abandon the archipelago. This is a certain fact. We can not evade this exigency. We should not falter, hesitate, and stickle about unimportant matters. We own the Philippines the same as we own Porto Rico, the Hawaiian Islands, and Alaska. The victory of Manila and a subsequent purchase of the islands settled this. The voice of the people—and they

ARE THE REAL MASTERS

of the Army and Navy, the Cabinet, and Congress—has been heard in no uncertain tones, and the Administration and its lines of policy have been fully and unmistakably indorsed; and the commission that every member of Congress, be he Democrat, Republican, or Populist, holds from the people requires him to give full force and effect to their will and demand.

It is no time nor occasion for partisan prejudice and rancor. The honor, good faith, and prestige of our country are at stake. Congress and the President must come up to the full measure of their duty with a spirit that does not quail before any burden or responsibility, and the patriotism and courage of the American people can be implicitly depended upon to do the rest. We must occupy our new possessions

IN FACT AS WELL AS IN NAME.

There can be no consistent, honest, contention about the right of sovereignty over them. The world, save the rebellious and insurrectionary Tagals and their friends elsewhere, acknowledges it. It is our duty to start the people of these regions on the lines of progress, development, education, and civilization by giving them immunity from the despoiler and marauder, the protection of our arms, and the peace, security, and inspiration of

ORDERLY AND STABLE GOVERNMENT.

The bill under consideration, though not all I desire and would ask, is a timely and necessary movement in this direction. It can not be denied that we are still at war, and the people have declared in their own sovereign way that we must remain at war until every armed foe to the flag is crushed or surrenders. To accomplish this the country must have an army. With the present conditions confronting us and the possibility of future complications, the inexorable logic of circumstances and the testimony of men learned in the arts of war, and who have calmly and impartially surveyed the whole field, agree that an army of 100,000 men maximum strength is not too large and burdensome. If the country was on a peace basis there might be something in the contention that this number is too great, but the country is at war and should be on a respectable and

SUFFICIENT WAR FOOTING.

And Congress can not shirk its obligation to make this provision. Expansion is not now an issue. The rising and the setting of the sun, the alternatives of day and night, the coming and going of the seasons, and the law of gravitation are not more fixed and enduring certainties. Whether our new possessions are the

trophies of inglorious conquest or the increment of honest purchase has passed the domain of debate, and he who spends his time and energies in discussing it is engaged in as idle and fruitless a work as if he were pitching straws down against the breast of a cyclone or hurling paper pellets against a solid stone wall.

GOD SAW THE NECESSITY

and made the argument, for expansion, liberty, education, civilization, and Christianity are the inherent rights of every man, woman, and child, whether living in this highly favored land or in the dark regions of the earth. He is determined to overthrow the habitations of cruelty and the citadels of superstition and oppression in His own way and at His own appointed time. He is determined that the fairest and most fruitful parts of His creation shall not be desecrated and impoverished for all time by the savage and the tyrant. He is determined that the dark isles of the Pacific and the benighted regions of the farther East shall feel the pulsing tide and the glow and inspiration of the world's new movement and be renovated and irradiated by the political, moral, and religious principles that make men great

AND NATIONS INVINCIBLE.

He is the same God that liberated the children of Israel; who fashioned a pillar of cloud for their guidance by day and kindled a pillar of fire for their guidance by night, and saved, after forty years' wandering through a wild and barren wilderness, a remnant of His chosen seed, and in His present providences, as far as human agency is concerned, the United States is the honored instrument, without its own seeking, in accomplishing all the parts of His wondrous plans. All opposing law, custom, precedent, and political measures will be swept away

BY THE RESISTLESS FORCES

he has set in motion.

Sordid commercialism and military pomp and power do not enter into the thought, purposes, and calculations of those who support this measure, though our new acquisitions are empires of natural wealth to which the world is entitled. If we had no other justification than these the flag would not be floating over Cuba, Porto Rico, Guam, and other islands, nor would we be fighting in the archipelago. The United States is not a sea pirate nor a land grabber. Her people are honest, well-intentioned, and independent, without envy and greed, as they are without fear; and a party that would advocate territorial extension at the sacrifice of high moral principles and the country's honor and integrity

WOULD NOT SURVIVE AN ELECTION,

and would go down to a grave of ignominy loaded with the deep-voiced execrations of an indignant people. Under the operations of this bill it is possible that an army of 65,000 men will be organized and sent to the Philippines. This army would be composed of the flower of our youth—strong, determined, courageous, and patriotic men—that would

MAKE SHORT SHRIFT

of that flying and fugitive pretender, Aguinaldo, and his following of savage insurrectionists. It would save thousands of valuable lives and millions of treasure. It would inspire, encourage, liberate, and protect the decent and intelligent Filipinos, who are pleased and jubilant over their change of destiny, are loyal to the United States, and pray for the earliest establishment of its peaceful authority over their war-wasted islands. It was ours to break the clutch of oppression and poverty, to feed the starving, clothe the naked, to provide shelter for those whose homes were burned, and to empty the prison hells in those islands, where Spain, without hindrance, had committed

THE MOST HORRIBLE ATROCITIES

for three centuries, and it is still ours to rescue the loyal Filipinos from their unhappy and unfortunate condition. Then a government would be erected in perfect accord with our own; there would be peace, security, and advancement in the islands, and there would be no necessity for an armed force save to guard the seacoast and garrison the military stations, to quell any uprising of the rebellious. My own contention is that Congress

SHOULD PROVIDE 100,000 TROOPS

for the immediate necessities in the Philippines; that this is just what the election of President McKinley and the overwhelming success of the Republican party mean. I am satisfied that this would be the path of safety and economy; that it would save life and money, and be an honorable discharge of our obligations in the cause of humanity and the world's civilization. It would show that we as a nation are terribly in earnest and that there is no immunity for those who resist its authority or challenge the assertion of its rights. Such a movement would be a most valuable object lesson in this epoch-making period.

It is still fresh in the memory that during the recent Presidential struggle we were constantly assured that we were in the shadow of the empire, but the people looked into the Presidential closet, and there they found

NO GHOST NOR SKELETON,

but there an altar shrine of lofty and devoted patriotism and sincere and absorbing sympathy for the helpless and outraged. And now this class of wiseacres and sages tell us that the intention of this army bill is to maintain by military force a government to be erected in the Philippines "antagonistic to our own in form and substance." Has such a fabric of horror been erected in Cuba or Porto Rico, where the natives, though not quite so intelligent or familiar with the robberies of taxation and perniciousness of trusts, yet are just about as

LOYAL AND TRUE TO THE FLAG

as many of our Democratic brethren? Have not these two islands the same Constitution, the same laws, the same kind of a judiciary, the same system and methods of government as our own? They are not outlying provinces, but wards of the nation, and the military is there to preserve order and peace and protect the people in the same liberties we enjoy. These islands are on the same footing, as far as the civil law is concerned, as our interior Territories, and when they are prepared for it by the processes of education and experience

THEY WILL HAVE A VOICE

in our governmental affairs.

As to this charge of imperialism, the cord is frayed, the cruse is broken, and the lamp is dead. Its unavailing service has terminated. There is not a single feature of the policy of the Administration or of the party which it represents that can be construed by any honest and intelligent interpretation into such an abhorrent and monstrous idea and aim.

The Administration, in providing for all the exigencies of the novel situation in these two islands, has been guilty of no act facing in this direction. Now, why should the Administration single out the Philippines for a revival of Caesarism, the horrors of a military despotism—"a government antagonistic to ours in form and substance?" Is that a fit and safe field, with peculiarly favorable conditions and opportunities for any American, however strongly he may be intrenched in the esteem and confidence of the people, to exploit himself as an un-American ruler? Such an idea sinks below the dignity and respectability of good nonsense. It is the idle chatter of the discomfited and crushed, beaten at the game of politics,

WITHOUT HOPE AND WITHOUT A FUTURE,

as they have no live, pertinent, and attractive issue to present to the people. They talk eloquently about the glories of the past, the value of tradition, and the magnificent possibilities of the future, forgetful of the fact that each epoch has its own heroes, sages, and philosophers and makes and writes its own history.

If there be a terror to our own people and a peril to the new citizenry of our "outlying provinces" in the proposition to increase our military establishment; if it be the purpose to subjugate the Filipinos and keep them in a state of vassalage and enslavement by the force of arms, surely this terror, peril, and purpose are not manifest in the civil municipal Philippine code, that follows closely along the lines of the laws of the United States, guaranteeing civil and religious liberty and

PROTECTION FOR PERSONS AND PROPERTY.

Even now, with the distractions and alarms of war, predatory incursions, and the forays of the banditti, the mailed hand and the iron rule of the military are subservient to civil procedures, and civil government is being erected throughout the archipelago, capital is making investments, and the rich and fertile regions are being developed under the ægis of law and order. The Taft Commission is hard at work organizing the country and establishing courts. The great majority of the people recognize American sovereignty and accept the new conditions

OF FREEDOM AND OPPORTUNITY

with delight. Kind treatment, and not musketry and artillery, is winning them over to peace and reconciliation, and they are beginning to give the American authorities implicit faith and confidence. Hundreds of the people, realizing the good intentions of their American friends and rescuers, are convinced that their conditions will be vastly improved under the flag, and they are taking the oath of allegiance. They now see how cruelly they have been misled and deceived by crafty leaders, who made them believe that the American soldiers were incarnate devils and

SURRENDER MEANT DEATH.

Make the war "short, sharp, and decisive" by sending enough of soldiers to hunt down the pestiferous insurgents, who are held together only by the encouragement of the blatant aunts of this country, and at once compel them to obedience or exterminate them, as they so richly deserve. Then tranquility and security will take the place of disorder, misgivings, uncertainties, and fears, and the steady and resistless march of progress and development will go forward and the triumph of intelligence, civilization, and Christianity over superstition, lawlessness, and savagery

WILL BE COMPLETE.

Then the door will be opened to China and we can manage our complications in that quarter with ease and dispatch. Then the door will be opened to farther India, whose teeming populations need and will buy enormous quantities of our productions. The supremacy of American law and systems in the Philippines, with their freedom-giving spirit, industrial infusion, and renovating agencies, will cut the Gordian knot of the Eastern problem, and in a commercial sense the whole Orient will be ours.

Those who oppose this measure of necessary military equipment object to it because it substitutes a regular army for a volunteer army, and insist that it would be an entailment for all time to come, burdening the people with the hardships of excessive taxation, and that it would create and foster a vainglorious and hurtful spirit of militarism such as dominates and enslaves the nations of the Old World. If they are honest, candid, and

SINCERE IN THIS INSISTENCE,

they are woefully and inexcusably ignorant of the widely differing conditions of this country and the monarchies of Europe. There the commonality is fettered and repressed, military service is compulsory, whilst the upper crust of society—the nobility—revel in the pride of power and the pomp of circumstance, and find their chief enjoyment in decorating themselves with the emblazonry of war trappings. The education of the American mind and the trend of American thought do not lead in the direction of martial glory, though when necessary the American people are not slow to rally to their country's banner and attest their valor and patriotism. They are devoted to the peaceful pursuits of industry, honest accumulation, and national aggrandizement.

They abominate the enterprise of war, with its bloody havoc and its gorgeous insignia has for them no attractions. They revere their free, peace-insuring institutions, and the throb of the war drum only quickens their pulses and stirs their hearts to courage and determination when the arbitrament of the sword is the only alternative. To assert that a regular army of 100,000 men—1 soldier to about 760 inhabitants—is a menace to the stability of our free Government is a bold and reckless challenge of the intelligence and patriotism of the American people, and to assert that they will not willingly and cordially meet the expenses of such a war footing is to brand them with the

MOST DISHONORING PARSIMONY.

Millions upon millions are annually spent in paying pensions, on coast defenses, Government buildings, the carrying of the mails, and the improvement of harbors and waterways, and yet the people never call a halt, knowing that the bounty of the Government to the disabled soldiers is a deserved gratuity, and the citadels of our defense and our facilities for communication and the diffusion of intelligence should comport with our increasing greatness as a nation.

Another objection to this bill, urged by those affrighted by the specter of imperialism, is, as they most vehemently assert and strenuously maintain, that it gives the President autocratic authority; that it enlarges his opportunities and possibilities to make himself the paramount factor in the control and direction of the Government, and that he may use the military

TO CRUSH LABOR

in its struggle to maintain its rights against the despotism and aggressions of corporate monopoly. These objectors have suddenly become the guardians of the laboring man and the custodians of popular liberty. From the foundation of the Government the President has been the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and in certain instances is invested with discretionary powers, and this bill in no respect warrants him in going beyond constitutional limits, and no President ever has been or ever will be rash and defiant enough to invade the province of the law-making power. He knows that it would cost him his official head and cover his name with everlasting odium and disgrace.

The bill authorizes the President to organize and maintain one provisional regiment in Porto Rico, to be composed of the natives of that island. It authorizes him, should he deem it advisable, to enlist in the United States service 12,000 natives of the Philippine Islands, to be used as scouts in the war for the suppression of the insurrection in the archipelago.

THIS PROVISION IS WISE AND TIMELY

in that it recognizes the fact that our new territorial acquisitions are a part and parcel of our national domain; that the inhabitants thereof are entitled to the badge of American citizenship; that they should have the opportunity of assisting in their own defense and in the organization and maintenance of their own government.

This bill is a positive and emphatic declaration of the American people that they are determined to follow the lines of progress and duty unmistakably marked out by the indications of Providence, and they heartily indorse and will enthusiastically sustain it, and instead of the meager number of 27,000 in the Army the 1st day of next July there will be a force of soldiery of which they will be proud and which will not disappoint their expectations.

Army Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. FITZGERALD,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, December 6, 1900,

On the bill (S. 4300) to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States.

Mr. FITZGERALD said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The pending measure provides for the reorganization of the Regular Army.

It is conceded that some legislation is required at this session to provide sufficient force to carry out the Administration's policy but recently indorsed by the people. Under the existing law the Army on the 30th of June next will consist of about 27,000 men. Unquestionably the country will need a larger Army than that for some time to come. Since the declaration of war against Spain all legislation increasing the Army has been of a temporary character. It has been intended to meet emergencies that demanded larger forces than are usually required by the country. The necessity for a force greater than that sufficient for the ordinary needs of the Government will undoubtedly continue beyond the 30th of July next.

Under the necessity of enacting some legislation the majority of this House propose a reorganization of the Regular Army. Such legislation has been discussed and pressed for some time. Experts in military matters severely criticize the present organization of the Army. With the duties and responsibilities devolving upon this country by reason of recent events, a permanent force of 27,000 men will no longer be adequate for the country.

Did this measure merely propose to increase the standing Army to a size commensurate with the country's needs, and at the same time improve and perfect the organization, I would not hesitate to give it my unqualified support. Unfortunately, however, the measure does not do this alone. By this bill it is proposed to reorganize the Regular Army, increase it as required by what seems to be the demands of the future, and at the same time provide the additional men that the present emergencies require. The reorganization is not made in view of the peace requirement of the country, but a permanent army is provided, based upon the temporary conditions of the present.

Some increase is needed in the standing Army of the country. Porto Rico and Cuba, the Philippine Islands, and, perhaps, the situation in China for many years will require the presence of American troops. In a short time, however, few men will be required in Porto Rico. If the pledges made in the beginning by this country are fulfilled, the day should be at hand when our troops will be withdrawn from Cuba. It is not to be expected that after an independent government is established there that American forces will be retained in the island. The increase in the Army will be necessary for service in the Philippines and to man the coast defenses of the States.

But if 96,000 men are sufficient to meet the demands of the service at the present time, such an army will be unnecessary when the emergencies of the present are past. That time may not be far distant. In his message to Congress President McKinley says:

There are assuring indications that the Philippine insurgents are coming to acknowledge the authority of the United States.

When such a condition is secured the force required to maintain order will be much smaller than that now needed to put down the insurrection.

The peace force of the country will be unnecessarily large if maintained as proposed by the pending bill.

It was never intended, and the people of the country will not indorse a proposition, to rely upon the Regular Army as the chief defense or force when the nation is in peril. The history of our country proves too conclusively that the volunteer is the Republic's reliance. This is not said in disparagement of the regular. He has a place and a glory gleaned from many bloody fields in the past that can never be snatched from him.

Under our free institutions, however, every citizen is equally interested in preserving the integrity of the Government. The people rely upon themselves to protect their rights and liberties with the same success in the future as has been had in the past. In times of peril, from foes within or without, it is the people who respond and arm to preserve their homes and their country. They do not wish, nor will they ever consent, to support a large army in idleness awaiting, perhaps praying, the necessity for their services.

The people of this country have profited by the experience of the nations of the Continent. In Europe the nations are staggering under the burdens of their military establishments. Young

men waste valuable years in the army. The natural resources of the country are to a certain extent neglected, while everything smacks of the camp.

Our policy has been different. It has been most wise. When at peace, as this country happily has been during the greater part of its history, the people devote themselves to the arts and the pursuits of peace. When the country is darkened by the cloud of war, then every man awaits in readiness the call for his services.

Under the provision of this bill the Army may consist of 58,000 or of 96,000 men. Power is lodged in the President to fix it within these limits at will. To me this is unwise. Such a power should not be delegated by Congress to any man. The law should be fixed so that the President would execute it as framed by the representatives of the people. The tendency seems to be growing to leave more and more to the discretion of executive officials. In many instances it is proper that officials be given certain discretion. Unless necessary it is unwise to encourage legislation of such nature.

In justification of the power given in the pending measure to the President to increase or diminish the Army, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] cited the following precedents in the history of Army legislation. I quote from the speech delivered December 5, 1900:

In the year 1798 there was difficulty, but not war, with France. By an act of May 28 of that year the President of the United States was authorized, "in the event of a declaration of war against the United States, or of actual invasion of their territory by a foreign power, or of imminent danger of such invasion, discovered, in his opinion, to exist, before the next session of Congress, to cause to be enlisted and called into service a number of troops not exceeding 10,000," etc.

On July 16 of that year—remember, there was no war then—the President was given a general authority—a discretionary authority—"to raise, in addition to the present military establishment, 12 regiments of infantry and 6 troops of light dragoons, to be enlisted for and during the continuance of the existing differences between the United States and the French Republic, unless sooner discharged."

In March, 1799, it was declared lawful for the President of the United States, among other things, "in case imminent danger of the invasion of their territory by any power shall, in his opinion, be discovered to exist," to organize 24 regiments of infantry, besides riflemen, artillerymen, and cavalry.

And he was allowed, when it appeared expedient, during the session of the Senate or in their recess, to appoint their officers.

Again, in the year 1800—May 14—when we were not at war, the President was authorized to suspend further military appointments.

Again, March 16, 1802, he was authorized, when he should deem it expedient, to organize a corps of engineers.

Again, in 1803—March 3—he was authorized, whenever he should judge it expedient, to require the executives of such of the States as he might deem expedient, and from their local situation most convenient, to take effectual measures to organize, arm, and equip, according to law, and hold in readiness to march at a moment's warning, a detachment of militia not exceeding 80,000, officers included.

Again, January 2, 1812, he was authorized, when he should have satisfactory evidence of actual or threatened invasion of any State by any Indian tribe or tribes, to raise, either by the acceptance of volunteers or by enlistment for one year, as many companies as he might deem necessary, not exceeding 6, as rangers.

Again, January 29, 1813, it was provided by Congress that there be raised such number of regiments of infantry, not exceeding 20, as, in the opinion of the President, may be necessary for the public service, to be enlisted for one year, unless sooner discharged.

Again, in 1832—June 15—the President was authorized to raise, by the acceptance of volunteers or by enlistments for one year, 600 mounted rangers, as the nature of the service may, in his opinion, make necessary.

Again, May 23, 1836, he was authorized to accept volunteers, either infantry or cavalry, not exceeding 10,000 men, to serve six or twelve months after they arrived at the rendezvous.

Gentlemen may say that these provisions merely give authority to enlist volunteers, and that the enlistment of volunteers is in accordance with precedent. But that is not all. In the year 1846—May 13—it was enacted—

"That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized by voluntary enlistment to increase the number of privates in each and any of the companies of the existing regiments of dragoons, artillery, and infantry to any number not exceeding 100, whenever in his opinion the exigencies of the public service may require the same; and to reduce the same to 64 when the exigencies requiring the present increase shall cease: *Provided*, That said enlistment shall be for the term of five years and no longer, unless sooner disbanded by the President."

Mr. Chairman, the manner in which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] has arranged his precedents clearly shows that they are not applicable to the present situation. Nearly every act cited was enacted at a time when, if hostilities were not actually impending, yet the signs of the times pointed so unmistakably to difficulty that it was the part of wisdom to prepare while yet time remained.

It will be noticed, too, that practically every act enumerated was at a period in the history of this country when communication was difficult between different sections of the country. The telegraph and the telephone had not been invented. The several portions of the country had not been banded with the irons of travel, and there were no steamboats to swiftly carry messages by the waters of the country.

In those days Congress could not be assembled with the same speed that it can be at present. The representatives from some States could hardly reach the Capital sooner than six months from the time the President issued the proclamation convening Congress in extraordinary session. Under such conditions it was the part of wisdom to clothe the President with some discretion. Only in the act of 1846, however, was the discretion given for a period of five years.

In the days when the majority of the acts cited here passed, the United States did not stretch from ocean to ocean and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf. The hostile Indians were powerful and a continual menace. Yet the power given to the President in this bill, when conditions are so different and such power so unnecessary, was never delegated by Congress in those days. I believe it unwise to do it now. A measure with such a provision can not receive my support.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Military Affairs, if it desired to propose a reorganization of our permanent Army, should have done so without complicating the measure with provisions for temporary requirements. Any measure that would properly reorganize the Army and increase it to the requirements of peace would receive my support, no matter what the source of its origin. I am ready, too, to vote every man and every dollar required at present and asked by the President. Since, in my judgment, this bill is unwise and dangerous in its delegation of power to the President, as well as contrary to our traditional policy and custom, which have proved wise and safe, I will vote for the substitute to be offered by this side of the House.

This substitute, Mr. Chairman, continues the law now in force for two years from the 30th of June next; it gives all the men needed and requested by the President. If adopted, time can then be taken to perfect a measure which will reorganize the Army on the most scientific lines and in the most satisfactory manner. Such action will be for the benefit of the Army and will receive the indorsement of the people irrespective of their political affiliations.

Against taxing Oleomargarine 10 cents a pound.

"The power to tax is the power to destroy."—Chief Justice Marshall.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY S. BOUTELL,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 7, 1900.

On the bill (H. R. 3717) to make oleomargarine and other imitation dairy products subject to the laws of the State or Territory into which they are transported, and to change the tax on oleomargarine.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois said:

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no cows, no steers, no dairies, no oleomargarine factories in the district which I have the honor to represent. I feel, therefore, that I am in a position where I can discuss this measure with the same impartiality and, I trust, with the same impunity with which I have partaken, together with the rest of my fellow-countrymen, of the two articles the production of which this bill aims respectively to prohibit and to protect.

I must confess, however, that I have never consciously eaten oleomargarine, but when the advocates of the compulsory consumption of butter admit, as they do in the legislation which they advocate for the protection of butter, that oleomargarine can only be distinguished from butter by some such means as a label in black roman letters an inch tall, we are justified in assuming that there is little if any difference in the wholesomeness or palatability of the two articles. I dare say we have all eaten oleomargarine and praised it as good butter, and eaten poor butter and condemned it as oleomargarine.

But even if the imitations of some articles surpass, in the opinions of many, their prototypes, I am in favor of every measure that seeks directly to prevent and punish deception and fraud in the sale of all commodities, especially articles of food.

When I pay for maple sirup I do not want to get a flavored preparation of corn cobs and glucose. When I pay for white clover honey I want to get bee-made and not man-made honey. When I pay for pure leaf lard I want to get an animal not a vegetable product. When I pay for Mocha coffee I want to get the Arabian not a Brazilian berry. And so when I pay for butter I want to get an extract of cream and not an extract of suet. I shall therefore support the substitute measure recommended by the minority of the committee, although I believe that it would be wiser to leave to the several States the whole matter of dealing with the prevention of fraud in the sale of commodities.

But the pending bill should, in my opinion, receive our severest condemnation. The grounds on which my convictions rest are briefly these:

First. It is unwise and dangerous to impose internal taxes for any other purpose than that of raising needed revenues; unwise, because there is no limit to which this principle can not be extended; dangerous, because all legislation that seeks to accomplish its ends by indirection tends to bring our laws into ridicule and

disrepute. The enactment of internal-revenue laws not designed for the purpose of raising revenue creates distrust and dissatisfaction with all our methods of taxation.

Public revenues can only be used for defraying the legitimate expenses of the Government. Internal taxation where no revenue is needed assumes therefore the character of a fine or punishment. This method of inflicting a penalty violates the principle that innocence is always presumed until guilt has been judicially determined.

Domestic taxation when no revenue is needed is tyranny.

Can it be contended at this time that the National Government is in need of additional revenues when we are about to reduce our taxes by \$30,000,000 or more annually?

For what purpose then does this bill propose to place a tax of 10 cents a pound on a certain quality of oleomargarine? It is openly avowed by the advocates of this measure that this tax is for the purpose of restricting and, if possible, preventing the manufacture of all oleomargarine that looks and tastes like butter, in order to prevent the fraudulent sale of any oleomargarine for butter. In other words, every honest manufacturer of oleomargarine that looks like butter, who sells it honestly for what it is, must pay a tax for honestly conducting an honorable industry in order that a fine may be imposed upon those who fraudulently deal in a part of the products of his industry.

But not 5 per cent of the oleomargarine product of this country is fraudulently sold as butter. Here, then, it is proposed to tax over 95 per cent of a product honestly dealt in for the sake of imposing a fine upon those who fraudulently deal in less than 5 per cent of the product. The fraudulent sale of all commodities can be prohibited by law. The passage of this bill would be a humiliating admission of the inability of Congress and the State legislatures to promulgate laws adequate to accomplish this result, or of the inability of the National and State executives to enforce such laws.

If we recognize this indirect legislation as right in principle and in harmony with our institutions, what limits shall we set to its application? Nearly all articles of commerce are cleverly imitated, and the imitations are either sold in competition with the originals or fraudulently represented to be what they are not. Shall we levy a tax on the imitations of cane sugar, honey, maple sirup, lard, coffee, tea, spices, tobacco, wines, liquors, kid gloves, gold, silver, and on all the other counterfeit representations of the staple articles of commerce?

And when we have taxed all domestic imitations of domestic goods, shall we then begin the taxation of the domestic imitations of foreign goods? Shall we tax our own manufacturers of table oils for the benefit of the foreign producer of olive oils? Shall we tax the New England packers of fish to prevent their competition with the foreign importers of sardines? And if it is right to endeavor to restrain and prevent fraud by taxation, why not invoke the taxing power to repress vice and crime?

When all these forms of taxation are in force, what a spectacle we shall have! A large part of the revenues of this nation derived from a tax on deceit, fraud, vice, and crime! The principle of legislation embodied in this bill is contrary to our national traditions and the spirit of our institutions. It is no sufficient answer to the objections to this measure to say that we have already made a precedent for legislation of this kind. If we have, let us not enlarge and strengthen that precedent, but rather let us root it up and destroy it.

If in moments of unreasoning prejudice we have strayed aside into the byways of indefensible legislation, let us hasten to retrace our steps and regain the path which alone leads to national safety and honor.

Second. This measure is distinctively class legislation. It discriminates between two rival domestic industries to the great advantage of one and the great detriment of the other. It is a hypocritical measure. On its face it is a bill to raise revenue; in the mouth of its advocates it is a bill to suppress fraud; in reality it is a bill to prevent honest competition.

The design of the framers of this bill was not to tax to death the fraudulent sale of 5 per cent of the oleomargarine product, but to tax to death the competition with butter of 95 per cent of that product.

Can we afford to lend ourselves to such a scheme?

I want to ask my Democratic friends if there is anything in the traditions of their party that sanctions or approves such legislation? Let me call to their minds the opinion of Thomas Jefferson on legislation of this character:

The government which steps out of the ranks of the ordinary articles of consumption to select and lay under disproportionate burthens a particular one, because it is a comfort pleasing to the taste or necessary to health, and therefore will be bought, is in that particular a tyranny. Taxes on consumption, like those on capital or income, to be just must be uniform.

Butter and oleomargarine are so essentially alike that it is as unjust to tax one without taxing the other as it would be to tax beer without taxing ale, or to tax whisky without taxing brandy, or to tax hand-made butter and exempt the product of the cream-

eries. It is absurd to claim that the farmers, especially the small farmers, will be benefited by the passage of this bill. The financial advantages accruing from the imposition of this tax will be reaped exclusively by the butter manufacturers.

Then, as now, they will dictate to the farmer the price of cream and to the consumer the price of butter. It is a reflection upon the honor of the millions of farmers of our country to pretend that they favor the principle embodied in this bill.

Let us not forget that they were nearly all farmers who fought when this nation was born for the establishment of the principle of equal rights for all and special privileges for none.

Third. If we admit that it is right to impose a tax by way of a penalty for fraud, such a tax should only be imposed when we can be absolutely sure that the tax will always be paid by the party guilty of the fraud. But if this bill should become a law, the manufacturer will simply add the tax to the original cost of the product. The bill gives no protection to the consumer. What, then, is the result? The National Government collects from the defrauded purchaser the tax that it has imposed upon the manufacturer for the privilege of perpetrating his fraud.

Fourth. The increase in the price of oleomargarine that would result from the passage of this bill would be an outrage upon those who buy oleomargarine, because at the price at which they can get it they prefer it to butter. Why should the strong arm of the National Government be stretched out to compel a poor man to eat that which in appearance is repugnant to his senses or else take from him 10 cents for every pound of oleomargarine which he eats that is colored to suit his fancy and his palate? This measure ought to be entitled "A bill to abolish the senses of the workingman and the poor, and to tax the use thereof."

The great British statesman and advocate of liberty, Pym, said: "The best form of government is that which doth actuate and inspire every part and member of a state to the common good."

Would every member of this state be actuated and inspired to the common good by such legislation as we now contemplate? Is it not more probable that every man who felt the burden of this unnecessary and unrighteous tax would look with scorn and hatred and contempt upon a government that would stoop to such duplicity in its legislation as to impose a tax that would fall upon all the poor of the country for the purpose of protecting a great and powerful industry?

Could any government go further in the creation and protection of a monopoly?

Fifth. The favor with which this bill is received is another evidence of the absorption by the Federal Government of powers which the founders of our institutions thought could be more wisely exercised by the States individually. Strong a Federalist as I am, I look with grave apprehension upon the rapid centralization of legislative powers that is now going on and the consequent weakening of the influence and dignity of the local legislatures.

It is a sign of danger in a republic when its citizens begin to lose pride and confidence in their local institutions and submit complacently to the loss of those powers and prerogatives which their ancestors would have given up only with their lives.

The longest step toward centralization that we have yet contemplated is this effort to invoke the taxing power of the Federal Government to accomplish by indirection that which ought to be left to the determination of the several States. In my opinion, this step should never be taken; and so, for the reasons which I have briefly outlined, I disapprove of this measure.

The Grout Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT G. COUSINS,

OF IOWA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, December 8, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 3717) to make oleomargarine and other imitation dairy products subject to the laws of the State or Territory into which they are transported, and to change the tax on oleomargarine.

Mr. COUSINS said:

Mr. SPEAKER: As I understand it, this Grout bill is a measure designed to prevent a monstrous fraud, not only on the people who by their toil produce butter, but upon everybody who consumes it. The proposition is to tax every article colored in imitation of butter 10 cents per pound. The law would not affect any product unless colored so as to imitate butter. In other words, it would affect nothing but fraud.

In 1886 Congress passed an act requiring every manufacturer of oleomargarine and other imitations of butter to stamp it and label it plainly so that it might not go to any consumer as genuine

butter. Instead of observing and obeying that law, the manufacturers of imitation butter, together with unscrupulous retailers, have adopted every sort of device to evade the law, and they have evaded it. They have evaded it by folding the wrappers of packages so that the name of the article, instead of appearing plainly on the outside, appears on the inside, and then they have evaded it again by instructing unscrupulous retailers how to conceal the stamp or to efface it on the packages.

But the various methods of evasion are unimportant when we have the incontestable fact that in 32 of the States which have passed laws absolutely forbidding the sale of imitation butter 62,825,582 pounds of oleomargarine were sold in the year 1899. These 32 States represent 50,117,440 of the population of the country, according to the census of 1890:

Population.	Population.
New York..... 5,907,853	South Carolina..... 1,151,149
Pennsylvania..... 5,228,014	Nebraska..... 1,058,910
Illinois..... 3,826,351	Maryland..... 1,042,390
Ohio..... 3,672,316	West Virginia..... 762,794
Missouri..... 2,679,184	Connecticut..... 746,253
Massachusetts..... 2,238,943	Maine..... 661,086
Michigan..... 2,063,889	Colorado..... 412,198
Iowa..... 1,911,896	New Hampshire..... 376,530
Kentucky..... 1,858,635	Washington..... 349,390
Georgia..... 1,837,353	Oregon..... 313,707
Tennessee..... 1,766,518	Vermont..... 332,442
Wisconsin..... 1,686,890	South Dakota..... 328,808
Virginia..... 1,655,980	Utah..... 207,005
Alabama..... 1,513,017	North Dakota..... 182,711
New Jersey..... 1,444,933	Delaware..... 168,493
Minnesota..... 1,301,826	
California..... 1,208,130	Total..... 50,117,440

The States and Territories which have not passed laws forbidding the sale of oleomargarine colored in semblance of butter are:

Population.	Population.
Texas..... 2,235,593	New Mexico..... 153,593
Indiana..... 2,192,404	Montana..... 132,156
North Carolina..... 1,017,947	Idaho..... 84,385
Kansas..... 1,457,083	Oklahoma..... 61,834
Mississippi..... 1,280,700	Wyoming..... 60,705
Arkansas..... 1,124,179	Arizona..... 59,629
Louisiana..... 1,118,587	Nevada..... 45,761
Florida..... 891,422	
Rhode Island..... 345,506	Total..... 12,604,790
District of Columbia..... 239,302	

The amount of oleomargarine sold in the thirty-two States forbidding it during the year 1899 was, as I have said, 62,825,582 pounds, and the amount sold in each State is shown by this table:

Yellow oleomargarine sold contrary to law in 1899.

State.	Dealers.	Pounds.
Alabama.....	21	226,053
California.....		74,923
Colorado.....	95	1,123,537
Connecticut.....	5	134,255
Delaware.....	48	40,475
Georgia.....	61	495,991
Illinois.....	2,029	18,638,921
Iowa.....	3	79,022
Kentucky.....	217	1,490,577
Maine.....	17	102,274
Maryland.....	69	1,791,950
Massachusetts.....	108	2,063,889
Minnesota.....	30	1,343,865
Missouri.....	231	3,133,313
Nebraska.....	73	1,024,985
New Hampshire.....	19	445,583
New Jersey.....	206	5,875,975
New York.....	14	292,788
North Dakota.....	18	7,710
Ohio.....	1,005	8,830,969
Oregon.....	3	41,250
Pennsylvania.....	717	11,433,341
South Carolina.....	24	258,159
South Dakota.....	4	55,432
Tennessee.....	83	714,640
Utah.....		8,450
Vermont.....	1	2,990
Virginia.....	121	1,139,400
Washington.....	5	63,345
West Virginia.....	172	1,206,805
Wisconsin.....	23	714,742
Total.....	5,492	62,825,582

Oleomargarine sold in States and Territories where it is legal to color.

State or Territory.	Dealers.	Pounds.
Alaska.....	5	18,080
Arkansas.....	55	880,389
Arizona.....	5	78,767
District of Columbia.....	61	816,848
Florida.....	82	890,225
Idaho.....	3	58,224
Indiana.....	206	3,923,228
Indian Territory.....	21	152,278
Kansas.....	186	1,658,544
Louisiana.....	140	1,043,562
Michigan.....	109	2,092,521
Mississippi.....	17	104,622
Montana.....		446,022

Oleomargarine sold in States and Territories where it is legal to color—Cont'd.

State or Territory.	Dealers.	Pounds.
Nevada.....		625
New Mexico.....	12	115,850
North Carolina.....	9	117,224
Oklahoma.....	10	3,594,984
Rhode Island.....	333	1,518,204
Texas.....	162	30,547
Wyoming.....	5	
Total.....	1,501	16,860,142

Not only has this grease been sold contrary to the laws of the various States, but also in violation of the Federal statute of 1886.

The secret of the whole matter is this: Oleomargarine can be produced for 10 cents per pound. According to a published statement of Swift & Co., it is composed of tallow, lard, and cotton-seed oil. Then is added milk to flavor it. By a system of hypocrisy and fraud, criminal and piratical, it is sold for 25 cents per pound, or for whatever the price of genuine butter may be at the time. The profit is from 10 to 15 cents per pound. As a leading oleo manufacturer of Chicago said to his trade in a circular letter of date October 22, 1898:

Your profit will be double the amount made from the butter you are now handling.

And while such a profit is possible the temptation to retailers is so great that it is inevitably taken advantage of.

If this measure is passed, it will accomplish one of two things: It will increase the cost of this fraudulent product, colored in semblance of butter, so that retail dealers will not be tempted to handle it, or it will cause the manufacturers to place oleo on the market in its natural color, which will deceive no one, and that is what is desired. If anyone wishes to use oleomargarine, let him buy it without the tax in its natural color and for what it actually is. It should not cost such a consumer to exceed 15 or 16 cents per pound. And if he likes it, let him be happy.

The manufacturers who contend that the production of imitation butter is a "legitimate industry" have had the opportunity to conduct a "legitimate industry" if they would. But they chose to conduct an illegitimate one. They chose to become outlaws, defying not only the laws of States, but the law of the United States, and the patience of the public has been taxed to the danger point. They have had fourteen years in which to realize that Congress does not make laws for fun, and they have had the notice of thirty-two States, by statutory enactments, which have been shamefully and defiantly violated, that oleomargarine, if sold at all, must be sold for what it is.

As for the constitutional objection urged by some against the bill, let them read the opinion of Mr. Justice Harlan, of the United States Supreme Court, in the case of *Plumley vs. Massachusetts*, (155 U. S., 461), in which he said:

And yet it is supposed the owners of a compound which has been put in a condition to cheat the public into believing it is a particular article of food in daily use and eagerly sought for by people in every condition of life are protected by the Constitution in making a sale of it against the will of the States in which it is offered for sale because of the circumstance that it is in an original package and has become a subject of ordinary traffic. We are unwilling to accept this view. We are of the opinion that it is within the power of a State to exclude from its markets any compound manufactured in another State which has been artificially colored or adulterated so as to cause it to look like an article of food in general use, and the sale of which may, by reason of such coloration or adulteration, cheat the general public into purchasing that which they may not intend to buy.

The Constitution of the United States does not secure to anyone the privilege of defrauding the public. The deception against which the statute of Massachusetts is aimed is an offense against society; the States are as competent to protect their people against such offenses or wrongs as they are to protect them against crimes or wrongs of more serious character. And this protection may be given without violating any right secured by the national Constitution and without infringing the authority of the General Government. A State enactment forbidding the sale of deceitful imitations of articles of food in general use among the people does not abridge any privilege secured to citizens of the United States nor in any just sense interfere with the freedom of commerce among the several States.

It seems to me that Uncle Sam has a constitutional right to protect his own constitution.

In the name of tallow, leaf lard, cotton-seed oil, and the Constitution, we are implored by the opponents of this bill to stand by the lawbreaker who greases our bread when we pay him to butter it. It is exceedingly queer how many purposes men try to make the Constitution serve. It has been evoked in behalf of bad ballots, and now it is urged in defense of worse butter.

The only thing fit to butter anything with is butter.

It is urged as an excuse for this fraud that oleomargarine contains no deleterious ingredients. Neither does horse flesh, and if a boarding-house keeper should serve horse meat to his boarders as a pretense for beefsteak, he would be just as guilty as the commercialists who color cotton-seed oil and tallow and sell it as the genuine product of pure cream.

A hair in the butter used to be regarded as an awful thing, but now statesmen would defend it on constitutional grounds, holding that the ingredients of hair are harmless and that its trade between States should be unrestricted.

I should like to board the opponents of the Grout bill for a session or two—not to make money, but just to diet them a while on their own medicine.

You can paint landscapes in any oil colors that you choose. That is fiction, and buyers must take their chances. But when it comes to things that are taken internally they should be properly labeled. When a landlord trusts me I feel that I should trust him, but this confidential relation can never exist while the oleo man is around with his criminal and commercial inducements.

When your physician allows you to eat so much butter per day, how can you know what to tell him when there has been an oleo man in the community?

When a firm sells a favorite brand of axle grease they take great pride in labeling it, even in the smallest packages, but the oleo men "are not so proud as some folks air;" they are willing to live in obscurity until they can amass a fortune and go elsewhere.

If anyone wants to lubricate his griddle cakes with machine oil, that is his business, but let him stand by his colors and convictions and not steal the creamy hue of innocent country heifers.

Mr. Speaker, it is getting so that ordinary boarders have no rights. You should have as much right to pass counterfeit money to the landlord as he has to pass counterfeit butter to you.

It is about time in this country when it should not be necessary to have a coroner's inquest or a chemical analysis of the victuals before asking the blessing.

The time will come in America, as it has come in several other countries, when it will be a crime to adulterate any article of food or drink, and this is the beginning of that time. My vote shall go for the Grout bill. It will pass this body as certainly as the House of Representatives represents the people of this country, and then the Senate will be responsible for its fate.

Reduction of War Revenue.

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. H. BROMWELL,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, December 13, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 12394) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898, and to reduce taxation thereunder.

Mr. BROMWELL said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Under the general authority given by the House to print remarks on the subject of the reduction of the war revenue, I desire to submit the following remarks, which, while not bearing directly upon the provisions of this bill, are yet so connected with the subject of the income derived from various sources of taxation, and particularly with the question of the proposed reduction in the tax upon express packages, as to make it proper to offer them as a contribution to the general knowledge upon this subject:

The matter of parcels posts, domestic and foreign, has been discussed for a number of years past by chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and kindred organizations with a view to securing legislation looking to the introduction of the system generally, not only as between the United States and foreign countries, but as among the several States. Conventions have already been made, by treaty or other agreement, by which parcels to a limited weight are transmitted through the mails at various rates, in all cases cheaper than these parcels could be carried by freight or express. Various bills looking to the establishment of this service have been before this and former Congresses, but up to the present time no action has been had upon any of them.

While personally I am not ready to commit myself to the support of any of these measures, I believe that any contribution to the general knowledge upon this subject which will throw any light upon the workings of the system, so far as it has already been adopted, and upon its value as a revenue producer to the Government in case it should be extended to the domestic service, is worthy of being put in permanent form for the use of members of this House. I therefore append hereto the following carefully prepared statement of Mahlon A. Winter, No. 339 Pennsylvania avenue N.W., being a report made to the Board of Trade of this city about a month ago, and if the facts set forth therein are true as to the difference in the charges made by the express companies for the handling of these small packages and the cost of carrying these packages by mail, the claim that the retention of the war-revenue tax on the express companies will work a destruction of their business must seem to be without sufficient foundation; for if the Government, which it is frequently claimed pays more for the transportation of its mail than a private corporation can afford to carry it for, can thus underbid these express companies on the carriage of these small packages, the only inference to be drawn is that the express companies must make a handsome profit on this business,

and must therefore be able to stand the tax imposed under the war-revenue law without any serious hardship, and the proper thing to do would be not to remove this tax, but to so amend the law that the express companies can not shift the burden from themselves to the individual shippers.

[By Mahlon A. Winter, No. 339 Pennsylvania avenue N.W., Washington, D. C. Copyright 1900, by M. A. Winter. Used by permission.]

PARCELS POST A COMMERCIAL NECESSITY—A CONSIDERATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE PARCELS POST AS AN AID TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRADE IN THE SMALLER ARTICLES OF COMMERCE.

America has served notice upon the nations of the earth that she is about to begin a campaign for the commercial supremacy of the world. In preparing for the task so enthusiastically undertaken she has overlooked the fact that she lacks at least one instrument of trade aggression necessary to enable her to carry out her high ambition.

If she is to honorably acquit herself in the struggle thus inaugurated, and achieve and hold that position in the commercial world which "manifest destiny" has decreed she should occupy, she must adopt prompt and vigorous measures to this end.

Much as we need these foreign markets yet to be secured, we are in greater need of cheap and rapid transportation facilities for sending our goods to our foreign customers after they have been sold. We have been slow to recognize the vastly superior advantages the European merchants and manufacturers enjoy over our own for reaching distant markets, but now, right on the eve of a great commercial struggle with well-equipped competitors, we fully realize that we are greatly in need of that very aid which the competing foreigner receives through what is known as the parcels post.

Let us then examine the parcels post and see if we can learn wherein it has become such a valuable stimulant to the commerce of other nations. If we find that it has exerted a marked influence on the commercial growth of other lands, we can not err in establishing a parcels post for ourselves.

WHAT IS PARCELS POST?

It is the object of a parcels post to make it possible to send or receive packages of merchandise of moderate weight through the mails instead of by express, enabling this to be accomplished at a minimum cost for transportation and with the same assurance of quick and reliable service we now enjoy when we post an ordinary letter.

When a package can only be sent to post-offices located within the country in which the package is mailed, the service is called a "domestic parcels post," but when a package can be sent from the country in which it is mailed to a post-office located in a foreign country it is known as a "foreign parcels post," and is created by a treaty between the two countries, known as a "parcels-post convention." A domestic and a foreign parcels post are governed by entirely different, distinct, and separate rules and regulations.

That the people of this country need both a domestic and a foreign parcels post in the broadest sense of the terms can not be denied. At present we have an internal or domestic system for the transportation of packages by mail when not exceeding 4 pounds in weight, for merchandise only, but the high rates of postage—16 cents per pound—and the limited number of pounds that can be sent preclude the use of this method on all except rare occasions, and thus make the use of private express companies necessary.

A foreign parcels post has become an absolute necessity to the people and manufacturers of the United States who have customers in foreign countries. The stringent rules of the Universal Postal Union absolutely close the international mail service as a mode of conveyance for packages of merchandise. The regulations of the union governing this matter, adopted at the Universal Postal Convention held in the city of Washington on July 4, 1891, section 5 of article 5, reads as follows:

"Packets of samples of merchandise may not contain any article having a salable value. They must not exceed 12 ounces in weight."

The interpretations of the Post-Office officials have greatly assisted in stiffening the rigidity of this rule, for it is held that—

"Goods sent for sale in execution of an order, or as gifts, however small the quantity may be, are not admissible at sample rates and conditions."

It has further been held that no complete article can be sent as a sample. In the case of a pair of gloves, for illustration, only one glove may be sent; one-half a suspender, one shoe, one sock, etc. These decisions drive the exporter of small articles to use the private international express companies. The regular foreign letter postage rates of 5 cents per one-half ounce, which amounts to \$1.60 for a 1-pound packet, or \$16 for 10 pounds, is, of course, too expensive a method to be used except in very rare cases.

The mere citation of these prohibitive charges and rigorous rules is quite argument enough to show that the only profitable way to ship packages of merchandise is through the mails, and this can only be done to those foreign countries that have succeeded in securing foreign parcels-post conventions from our Post-Office officials.

HANDICAPS OF THE EXPORTER.

Let us look at the workings of our present mode of transportation as affecting the exporter. As an illustration, I will cite one of hundreds of similar experiences that have come under my personal observation.

There is a business concern located in Washington which has correspondents in every foreign country and which finds great difficulty in holding its own against foreign competitors in the same line of goods on account of not being able to avail itself of the transportation facilities its foreign competitors enjoy, which are afforded them by the parcels post. A short time ago this company received a small order from a correspondent who resides in an interior town in the Argentine Republic. There is no parcels-post convention between the Argentine Republic and the United States, so the only resource for the transportation of this order was via the ordinary ocean express lines. The package weighed only 3 pounds. Upon inquiry it was found that the express charges on this package would be \$6.00. An examination of the British Postal Guide showed that, had this company been conducting its business under the British flag, the package could have been sent through to its destination for 2 shillings 4 pence—the equivalent of 57 cents.

Any Mexican exporter could have sent 11 pounds for only 38 cents, while a German exporter could send an 11-pound package to the same place for 73 cents. In other words, if two articles of commerce identically the same, each weighing 3 pounds, the wholesale price also being the same, were ordered by a person residing at the same place in the Argentine Republic, one ordered from England by parcels post and the other ordered from the United States by the present American system of transportation, these two articles when placed on sale side by side in the Argentine Republic would show that the American-made article would cost just \$5.73 more than the one the product of English skill.

Another incident illustrating the deplorable lack of transportation facilities the American exporter of small articles has to contend with was brought strikingly to my attention in one of our recent consular reports. The case was that of a Birmingham (England) merchant who ordered a bill of goods from an American house in Minneapolis, Minn., and was compelled to pay \$14.35 transportation charges on a small package of merchandise the purchase price of which was only \$9.30. This was due to the fact that the goods were shipped by the American house without arrangements having been made in advance as to the rates. When this is not done, any shipper will tell

you that the ocean express companies and the receiving and forwarding agents will almost always take advantage of the opportunity to make excessive charges for foreign shipments. Need one wonder, then, that the American invasion of the foreign markets of the world is necessarily slow when such obstacles as these are to be met on all sides?

Under our present transportation facilities with South America we are absolutely unable to reach the interior towns. If we desire to send anything to the interior, after first paying exorbitant rates to get our goods to the nearest seaport town of the consignee, which may be a thousand miles from him, the party to whom they are addressed must then send to the coast and get them. On small packages the cost of this overland transportation is very high, and practically prohibits all interior trade in both small and trial orders of goods.

There is a simple and effective remedy for all this. Just give us a foreign parcels post, the same as is enjoyed by our European competitors, and we will then have a cheap, sure, and direct means by which we can reach the interior towns of South America.

The benefit of a foreign parcels post is to be examined in two lights, viz., from the standpoint of its utility to both the consumer and the manufacturer. Both interests are of equal importance. Merchants will carry in stock that for which there is a demand. Nearly all goods are now sold to merchants by sample, exhibited in a personal interview or sent in response to a request. By the distribution of samples through the medium of a foreign parcels post the manufacturer is enabled to create a demand and thus introduce his goods into strange markets. The manufacturer can greatly increase the demand for his goods by sending samples of his productions direct to the merchants of the world and permitting them to determine as to the advisability of carrying his wares in stock.

Again, there are many instances where goods can not be procured from the home merchant that might be obtained direct from the country where they are produced, were we fortunate enough to possess a foreign parcels post.

Nearly all the nations of the earth, both great and small, already enjoy this happy trade blessing, while the citizens of the United States are compelled to confine their trade within restricted limits, unless they pay a wholly disproportionate sum to the international express companies for the most trifling service.

WHY IS OUR GOVERNMENT APATHETIC?

At the present time the United States is the only great nation that does not possess an elaborate system of both domestic and foreign parcels post. This apathy, in my opinion, is due in a great measure to "official courtesy" in the United States Post-Office Department.

It is not generally known, but it is nevertheless a fact, that the Postmaster-General, by and with the consent of the President, has the power to negotiate and conclude a parcels-post convention with any foreign government with which, in his discretion, he may see fit to treat.

This power has been so seldom used that those having commercial and manufacturing interests in this country that would be greatly benefited by an extension of the foreign parcels post have become greatly exasperated.

The President of the United States could, and no doubt would, direct the Postmaster-General to immediately institute negotiations for a parcels-post convention with every foreign government, both large and small, if he but realized the necessity of such action on his part.

The adoption of a domestic parcels post will require an act of Congress; therefore we will have to look to that body for the required legislation.

We all know that the exporter of articles of great bulk, such as steam engines, farming implements, manufacturing machinery, structural steel, agricultural products, etc., is not seriously affected by the question of transportation by parcels post, as he chartered his vessel or makes yearly contracts for the transportation of his goods; but to the exporter of articles of small bulk, of "the little things that count" in commerce, the question of transportation assumes an entirely different aspect. It is a matter of common knowledge that the life of his export trade lies in the cheapness with which he can get his goods to the consumer. Even the manufacturers of the large articles of commerce would use both a foreign and domestic parcels post to great advantage in sending samples, specimens of the material and workmanship of their productions.

It seems almost incredible that this apathy should be prevalent in the face of the many reports of the Postmaster-General of the United States that have been favorable to the adoption of a parcels post, and the indorsement of this system by a number of prominent Superintendents of Foreign Mails in the Post-Office service.

Under Postmaster-General Don M. Dickinson, Nicholas M. Bell, then Superintendent of Foreign Mails, in his report dated August 6, 1888, said:

"The conclusion of a parcels post with Mexico is of special importance, as that country, with its large population and with rapidly developing industries, naturally looks to the United States for extending every possible aid in strengthening the bonds of commercial relations between the two great 'sister Republics,' whose interests are the same, and it will be found that new and hitherto almost inaccessible markets have been opened out to American merchants."

In this same report Mr. Bell further said:

"Parcels-post conventions are now pending with all the Central and South American States, and it is hoped the time is not far distant when the 'three Americas' will be embraced in one grand parcels-post union, which will in its way aid this country in fulfilling its eventual mission, viz., to control the markets of this hemisphere and become the leader in its industrial and commercial progress."

The Hon. John Wanamaker, Postmaster-General in 1890, in his annual report of November 29 of that year said:

"Nearly every country in Europe has established a parcels post and managed it successfully, to the great satisfaction of the people. The conditions of commerce are much the same all over the world, and if there are no objections from business people in the old countries, after years of experience of the parcels post, there would not be objections here after it was fairly tried. It can only be a question of time before it will be undertaken in some better form in this country. * * * I am in favor of a full parcels post."

In his report to the President, dated November 25, 1893, the Hon. W. S. Bissell, Postmaster-General, said:

"The desirability of the enlargement of the parcels post, so as to have it apply especially to European countries and Great Britain, has been brought to my attention. * * * The parcels post seems to me to be of most importance, and it is my purpose to give it early attention."

Yet, in the face of these indorsements by these prominent and clear-headed men, but few steps have been taken toward the active extension of either the domestic or foreign parcels post.

During the time that Nicholas M. Bell was Superintendent of Foreign Mails earnest efforts were made to present to Congress the advantage that would result from the adoption of a domestic and foreign parcels post; but since Mr. Bell's time we have not had a vigorous and healthy parcels-post policy. "Industrial and commercial progress" laments the retirement of Mr. Bell.

THREATENED COALITION.

The German central bureau for the preparation of commercial treaties has just published a book entitled *The Commercial Treaties of 1902*, written by its president, Dr. Voelberg-Rekow, who was also a delegate to the late Export

Exposition at Philadelphia. In this book, which is a practical study of the wonderful commercial development of the United States, with a discussion of its effects upon the commercial powers of Europe, particularly Germany, whose present commercial treaties expire in 1903, are to be found many interesting and startling statements.

Dr. Rekow sees in the commercial growth of the United States a dire calamity to European industries. He quotes figures to show that we are year by year driving our European competitors out of the markets of the world. He shows that by our thrift we are making an industrial dependent of the continent of Europe. On this point he says:

"Europe, with her old-established industries, is so hard pushed by the young American competition that the necessity of uniting in a common customs league against the bold intruder has become a matter of serious consideration."

This condition he would endeavor to remedy by a policy of joint commercial aggression and discrimination against the United States, and the renouncing of the "most-favored-nation clause" with America. The article is withal a deep, frank, and sensible study of commercial conditions in America and Europe, and will prove of great benefit to the United States if we are shrewd enough to apply ourselves to the task of offsetting the impediments which European jealousy will no doubt soon be throwing in the way of our progress.

Dr. Rekow is not slow to see that we have already won the day in our fight to obtain the position of the greatest exporter of agricultural products of the world. He admits, with refreshing frankness, that now the battle must be waged for the world's commercial supremacy of the industrial products. Of our victory in the one case and intention in the other he speaks as follows:

"After the Americans had established their supremacy as exporters of agricultural products, which export they have organized in such a masterly manner as to defy all competition, they immediately turned to exportation of industrial products, not of the finest quality, but carefully finished, and by means of wholesale production, put at so low a price that they will in a very little while conquer the world's markets."

This quick realization on the part of Germany of the point upon which the battle hinges seems to be even ahead of that of some of our own officials here in the United States, who are supposed to have the commercial interests of the country at heart, and whose public duty it is to search out and take advantage of every honorable opportunity to push American commerce to the front.

Reduced to a plain matter-of-fact question, it is this: Shall we develop our right arm of commerce and leave our left wholly neglected? That equality of development necessary to the human form is equally as necessary to every healthy nation. Having secured the agricultural, we must secure the industrial markets of the world as well.

England will not surrender her high position in the commercial world without a severe struggle. This is foreshadowed in a speech delivered by the Earl of Rosebery on November 16, 1900, at the Glasgow University. He declared that the twentieth century would be a period of keen, intelligent, and almost fierce international competition in the arts of peace; therefore it was necessary that England should remodel her state machinery and become more thorough in business and look thoroughly to the training of first-rate men for the struggle ahead, as upon this depended the future of the Empire. He thought that the now antiquated methods had almost resulted in commercial disaster.

The fact that foreign nations are now fighting and will continue to fight their hardest to retain these markets, the invasion of which we have already begun, makes it imperative that our industries be granted every assistance within the gift of our Government. A complete system of both domestic and foreign parcels post will do much to hold the ground we have already gained toward the accomplishment of our object, and will place in the hands of our exporters additional facilities with which to continue the struggle on a more equal basis with our commercial rivals.

CONVENTIONS ALREADY SECURED.

We have already negotiated foreign parcels-post conventions with Mexico and a few minor republics in Central and South America, and the West Indies, and a very much one-sided convention with and in favor of Germany, one of our hardest European rivals in the struggle for commercial supremacy. I shall deal more fully with this particular convention later on. Strange to say, this German parcels-post treaty is the only one we have with any European nation. The result of the conventions already in force have been highly gratifying, and the only cause of complaint has been the limited number of countries to which this wonderful trade promoter has been extended.

If we are to enter upon an era of commercial supremacy and are to find new markets for our products in foreign countries, we must be able to stand at least upon the same footing as our competitors in order to be able to secure and hold the trade they now control.

While it is true that American skill and inventive genius lead the world, and the skilled American workman stands to-day without a peer, still we can not rely on this alone to conquer foreign markets. It is now, at the very inception of our foreign commercial campaign, that our American manufacturing and commercial houses most need this very aid which is denied them. I fear they can not in many cases successfully run the race of keen competition with the millstone of excessive transportation charges tied to their necks, while at the same time their feet are fettered by our own regulations, which ought to render them every aid within the gift of this Government, instead of balk and thwarting their efforts.

Give to Americans that same aid and assistance in securing foreign trade that their competitors enjoy and the products of Yankee workmanship will invade new sections of every country on the globe where trade or larger is known, from the wildest haunts of the untutored savage to the busiest commercial marts of the enlightened Caucasian.

NEED OF A DOMESTIC PARCELS POST.

The need of a domestic parcels post is so evident that it seems hardly necessary to urge reasons for its adoption. There is one point, however, which seems in previous arguments to have been overlooked. This point in itself should be a matter of special consideration.

There are many millions of people in the United States who live at a distance from any express office, and consequently when anything is sent to them they must go for it in person or procure the services of some neighbor or friend. In rural localities, where excursions to railroad stations are not an everyday occurrence, it often proves very aggravating to be compelled to suspend the performance of important duties and make a special trip to a distant express office for one little package, which, perchance, is very much needed.

As is well known, the express companies are very arbitrary in their dealings with their patrons. For illustration, if the package is not called for within a few hours after its arrival, no matter how many miles the person for whom it is intended may live from the express office, the express agent is instructed by the express company to report the same to them, and they immediately send the person or firm who sent the package a form communication, reading about as follows:

"Goods consigned to John Smith reported by express agent at Jonesboro as remaining on hand uncalled for. Please instruct us as to disposition."

The receipt of such a notice by the party or firm sending the goods is very

apt to impair or affect the business standing of the party ordering, who, although having no intention whatever of defaulting in accepting the goods ordered, is confronted by embarrassing and what almost seems actual evidence of such an intention.

If a domestic parcels post was in vogue such a situation could not arise, for the package would be brought direct to the post-office of the consignee. The time, trouble, and expense that would thus be saved to our rural community should constitute no trivial factor in the consideration of this question while we are weighing the advisability of asking Congress to give us a domestic parcels post, for though in a single and individual instance the economy is not conspicuously manifest, the accumulation of such instances rolls up a total that would make the bank accounts of many of our multi-millionaires seem like a parody on wealth. Someone who has taken the trouble to dig for facts in the case and compute results has said that the enormous sum of \$30,000,000 is annually spent by the people of this country who reside in non-railroad communities, owing to the lack of the proper facilities for package transportation. In no event could the adoption of a domestic parcels post be considered as anything but a brilliant stroke of national economy.

The benefits to be derived by the people of this great country by reason of the adoption of a domestic parcels post are so apparent that the following table has been prepared to show the number of express offices in each State and Territory upon which our people now have to rely for the receipt and dispatch of their packages. The table also shows the greater number of post-offices at which the same packages could be received and dispatched if a domestic parcels post was in operation in this country.

For illustration, a careful perusal will show that in the great State of Pennsylvania there are only 919 express offices, whereas millions of packages are received and dispatched annually by the inhabitants of that State. It is shown that there are 5,206 post-offices or places at which the same packages would be received and dispatched under the domestic parcels post plan. What a great saving of time and money this would prove to the residents of Pennsylvania! Apply this illustration to the whole country and you will begin to realize what the parcels post means to this nation.

The table shows the average cost for express packages of 11 pounds from New York City to each State and Territory, compared with what it would cost to send the same package by parcels post, if the German domestic parcels-post rates were adopted. In making the comparisons, don't forget that the express package will go to the railroad station only, while the package sent by parcels post will go clear through to the post office of the person addressed.

It will also be seen that the German and Mexican exporters can reach our post-offices with their 11-pound packages much cheaper than we can, under our present system of private express companies, by means of which we only reach our railroad stations. The table shows the saving on each 11-pound package sent to an American purchaser when sent from Germany or Mexico, under their treaty terms, instead of from places in the United States.

States.	Average charge on 11-pound package from New York City to each State and Territory.	Number of express offices in each State and Territory at which the package can be received.	Number of post-offices in each State and Territory at which the same package can be received were a domestic parcels post established.	Postage on 11-pound package from any post-office to any post-office in the United States if domestic parcels post is established, at German rate.	Saving per 11-pound package by reason of using the mails instead of private express companies, based on New York City shipments.	German goods can now be delivered to any post-office in the United States in 11-pound packages for 68 cents. The following shows how much cheaper the German can deliver per package than we ourselves, based on New York City shipments.	Mexican goods can now be delivered to any post-office in the United States in 11-pound packages for 66 cents. The following shows how much cheaper the Mexican can deliver per package than we ourselves, based on New York City shipments.
Alabama.....	\$1.33	334	2,445	\$0.12	\$1.21	\$0.75	\$0.67
Alaska.....	3.89	3	53	.12	3.77	3.51	3.33
Arizona.....	3.89	41	202	.12	3.77	3.51	3.33
Arkansas.....	1.66	202	1,880	.12	1.54	1.08	1.00
California.....	3.16	586	1,059	.12	3.04	2.58	2.50
Colorado.....	2.67	251	743	.12	2.55	2.09	2.01
Connecticut.....	.61	108	511	.12	.49	.03	.01
Delaware.....	.61	17	177	.12	.49	.03	.01
District of Columbia.....	.97	5	14	.12	.85	.39	.31
Florida.....	1.66	283	1,126	.12	1.54	1.08	1.00
Georgia.....	1.33	451	2,057	.12	1.21	.75	.67
Idaho.....	2.43	49	424	.12	2.31	1.85	1.77
Illinois.....	1.09	1,495	2,622	.12	.97	.51	.43
Indiana.....	1.09	879	2,209	.12	.97	.51	.43
Indian Territory.....	2.19	89	505	.12	2.07	1.61	1.53
Iowa.....	1.46	1,056	1,907	.12	1.34	.88	.80
Kansas.....	1.94	806	1,685	.12	1.82	1.36	1.28
Kentucky.....	1.22	471	2,892	.12	1.10	.64	.56
Louisiana.....	1.46	173	1,116	.12	1.34	.88	.80
Maine.....	.61	248	1,254	.12	.49	.03	.01
Maryland.....	.79	121	1,210	.12	.67	.21	.13
Massachusetts.....	.61	781	856	.12	.49	.03	.01
Michigan.....	1.22	737	2,161	.12	1.10	.64	.56
Minnesota.....	1.66	599	1,616	.12	1.54	1.08	1.00
Mississippi.....	1.66	296	1,819	.12	1.54	1.08	1.00
Missouri.....	1.46	781	1,621	.12	1.34	.88	.80
Montana.....	2.19	119	1,074	.12	2.07	1.61	1.53
Nebraska.....	2.19	536	1,487	.12	2.07	1.61	1.53
Nevada.....	3.89	35	186	.12	3.77	3.51	3.33
New Hampshire.....	.61	229	574	.12	.49	.03	.01
New Jersey.....	.61	452	926	.12	.49	.03	.01
New Mexico.....	2.79	63	312	.12	2.67	2.21	2.13
New York.....	.61	1,309	3,735	.12	.49	.03	.01
North Carolina.....	.97	301	3,002	.12	.85	.39	.31
North Dakota.....	2.67	206	600	.12	2.55	2.09	2.01
Ohio.....	1.09	1,362	3,398	.12	.97	.51	.43
Oklahoma.....	2.19	80	576	.12	2.07	1.61	1.53

States.

States.	Average charge on 11-pound package from New York City to each State and Territory.	Number of express offices in each State and Territory at which the package can be received.	Number of post-offices in each State and Territory at which the same package can be received were a domestic parcels post established.	Postage on 11-pound package from any post-office to any post-office in the United States if domestic parcels post is established, at German rate.	Saving per 11-pound package by reason of using the mails instead of private express companies, based on New York City shipments.	German goods can now be delivered to any post-office in the United States in 11-pound packages for 68 cents. The following shows how much cheaper the German can deliver per package than we ourselves, based on New York City shipments.	Mexican goods can now be delivered to any post-office in the United States in 11-pound packages for 66 cents. The following shows how much cheaper the Mexican can deliver per package than we ourselves, based on New York City shipments.
Oregon.....	\$3.16	133	862	\$0.12	\$3.04	\$2.58	\$2.50
Pennsylvania.....	.61	919	5,206	.12	.49	.03	.01
Rhode Island.....	.61	90	153	.12	.49	.03	.01
South Carolina.....	.97	310	1,372	.12	.85	.39	.31
South Dakota.....	2.67	229	639	.12	2.55	2.09	2.01
Tennessee.....	1.22	326	876	.12	1.10	.64	.56
Texas.....	2.19	662	2,908	.12	2.07	1.61	1.53
Utah.....	2.67	143	348	.12	2.55	2.09	2.01
Vermont.....	.61	181	575	.12	.49	.03	.01
Virginia.....	1.22	263	3,468	.12	1.10	.64	.56
Washington.....	3.41	177	828	.12	3.29	2.83	2.75
West Virginia.....	1.22	283	1,889	.12	1.10	.64	.56
Wisconsin.....	1.46	697	1,926	.12	1.34	.88	.80
Wyoming.....	3.16	64	312	.12	3.04	2.58	2.50
Total.....		20,155	75,000				

To enable you to better realize the immense convenience to the people of this country that would result in their being able to receive their packages at their post-offices instead of at their express offices, your attention is invited to the fact that there is an average of only one express office to each 179 square miles in the United States, while there is one post-office to each 54 square miles. This means that each express office has an average of 3,371 people to serve, who are extended over 179 square miles, while there is an average of 856 inhabitants dependent on each post-office, who are located in 54 square miles.

HISTORY OF PARCELS POST.

Parcels post is not a Utopian scheme devised for the special benefit of any particular class of people possessed of commercial designs. It originated in the fertile brain of that great Englishman, Sir Rowland Hill, whose many and great postal reforms have caused his name to be revered as a public benefactor throughout the civilized world. Sir Rowland desired to institute the parcels post at the same time he introduced the penny post, in 1840, but at that early date English public sentiment had not reached the high plane to which it has since ascended on this subject, and the official public mind could not endure a more violent revolution than that to which he had already subjected it. He therefore refrained from pressing the parcels-post idea at that time, and devoted his whole time and energy to completing and perfecting his penny-post plan, which was then being given its first practical trial. History fully records how well this plan has succeeded. A contemporaneous poet tells us that—

"Every morning, true as the clock,
Somebody hears the postman's knock."

Forty years after Sir Rowland first started the penny-post idea the neglected portion of his plan was taken up and the parcels post was incorporated in the British postal system. It is useless at this late date to further eulogize Sir Rowland and his wise and sagacious plans, for their brilliant and enduring success has raised a monument to his memory that will endure for all time.

The following table shows what it costs to send a package from any post-office to any other post-office in the United Kingdom:

	Cents.
1-pound package.....	6
2-pound package.....	8
3-pound package.....	10
4-pound package.....	12
5-pound package.....	14
6-pound package.....	16
7-pound package.....	18
8-pound package.....	20
9-pound package.....	22
11-pound package.....	24

In Germany it only costs 12½ cents to send an 11-pound package from any post-office to any other post-office. The same low rate also applies on German packages that are sent to Austria-Hungary.

In Switzerland packages are carried from one post-office to any other post-office in the Republic for 8 cents for each 11-pound package.

ENGLISH AND GERMAN EXPERIMENTS.

England's commercial supremacy and Germany's immense foreign commerce are largely indebted to the admirable parcels post conventions they have consummated with nearly every foreign government on earth. At the same time they have not neglected to make their domestic parcels post a boon and blessing to their people. In either country it is possible to forward a package weighing up to 11 pounds with the same ease and certainly as that with which we can send an ordinary letter.

The British postmaster-general's report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1899, shows that so long as there is a single foreign country with whom Great Britain has no parcels-post convention English vigor and energy will not be abated in their efforts to perfect her system of foreign parcels post, and to this end treaties were entered into during the year with Russia, Formosa, the Banks and Santa Cruz Islands, the Comoro Islands, Kiachow in China, Nigeria,

Guatemala, and Bolivia. This leaves the United States as the only important nation with whom England has yet to make a parcels-post convention. This she has made strenuous efforts to accomplish for the past fifteen years, but without success.

The British postmaster-general's report for the year ending March 31, 1900, contains some interesting information regarding parcels post. No new conventions were concluded for the reason that they have already closed with nearly every civilized country in the world, with the glaring exception of the United States. It shows that in England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, where the domestic parcels-post system of Great Britain is in operation, a total of 75,448,000 parcels were sent through the mails. This means about two packages for each inhabitant.

The British post-office authorities have ascertained the fact that whenever a British parcels-post convention is concluded with a foreign country it immediately increases the exchange of parcels between the two countries about 17 per cent.

The returns of the London Board of Trade show the value of the goods exported and imported during the last two years by foreign parcels post to be as follows:

Year.	Imported.	Exported.
1898-99	\$9,165,035.27	\$10,712,764.51
1899-1900	5,444,728.18	20,495,670.02

These facts form an eloquent tribute to the practical and successful operation of the English parcels-post system, both domestic and foreign. In fact, it is easy to see that the British post-office is run on liberal, far-sighted business principles, and this is, no doubt, why it was able to turn into the British treasury during the fiscal year a profit of \$18,070,772.97.

The annexed table shows the operations of the British domestic parcels post for the past fifteen years. It will be noted that the extent of its use has steadily and constantly increased.

Year.	Number of parcels.	Increase per annum.	Gross amount received in postage.	55 per cent paid to railway companies for transportation.	Post-office share.
1884-85	22,910,040		\$2,475,162.89	\$1,249,505.64	\$1,225,657.25
1885-86	26,417,397	15.3	2,882,772.15	1,455,876.70	1,426,895.39
1886-87	32,800,154	24.3	3,502,075.44	1,757,378.46	1,744,696.98
1887-88	36,732,000	11.8	3,953,290.68	1,988,984.03	1,964,306.65
1888-89	39,589,000	7.8	4,278,523.69	2,168,518.80	2,110,205.09
1889-90	42,852,000	8.2	4,636,790.31	2,353,700.22	2,283,090.09
1890-91	46,288,000	8.0	5,044,214.51	2,599,638.20	2,444,576.31
1891-92	49,379,000	6.6	5,404,014.98	2,822,544.86	2,581,470.12
1892-93	52,370,000	6.1	5,723,267.63	2,983,405.83	2,739,862.00
1893-94	54,054,000	3.1	5,913,324.45	3,085,125.52	2,828,198.93
1894-95	57,136,000	5.7	6,259,737.29	3,281,902.74	2,977,834.55
1895-96	60,327,000	5.0	6,684,449.69	3,524,672.24	3,159,777.75
1896-97	63,715,000	5.2	7,097,763.62	3,717,305.09	3,380,458.53
1897-98	67,823,000	6.4	7,941,176.91	3,661,689.69	3,279,487.22
1898-99	71,913,000	6.0	7,295,742.13	3,858,877.29	3,436,864.84

EXPERIENCE OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

Other governments were not slow to adopt this new method of parcels communication in both its domestic and foreign features. The success of English experiments was hardly assured before Germany, France, Mexico, Spain, Italy, and many other countries began perfecting similar systems for themselves. These governments have followed closely in the footsteps of the British pioneer, with the result that these efforts have wonderfully improved their internal facilities of communication and made accessible to their citizens and manufacturers the people and markets of distant countries.

These countries have been well pleased with the results accruing to them from the adoption of a domestic and foreign parcels post, and the immense volume of business done through this system is an excellent indication of its manifest value to trade and commerce. I append hereto a table, compiled from the latest reports obtainable, showing the total number of parcels transported by the parcels-post method throughout the world and the use accorded both systems by the respective countries of the globe.

Names of countries.	Domestic service, number of parcels.	Number of foreign parcels—	
		Received.	Dispatched.
Argentina	400,052	26,849	8,622
Austria-Hungary	31,238,372	9,705,922	5,439,308
Belgium	1,683,507	894,318	447,481
Bolivia	14,318		
Bosnia-Herzegovina	47,828	240,494	91,703
Bulgaria	93,942	55,684	7,542
Canada	1,747,470		(1)
Chile	623,847	10,316	4,680
Costa Rica	13,696	5,929	434
Denmark	1,997,176	543,499	91,004
Egypt	120,000	114,000	71,800
France	37,962,964	1,088,644	3,770,941
Germany	150,605,675	5,105,527	7,679,994
Greece	120,150	20,956	4,505
Holland	3,933,982	592,920	254,731
Honduras, Republic of		78	60
India, British	1,480,014	132,232	121,986
Italy	6,303,291	1,046,925	602,813
Kongo Free State	436	3,606	111
Japan	4,070,053	6,294	4,590
Luxembourg	147,029	202,079	100,367
Mexico	95,454	93,912	9,016
Norway	223,800	294,700	31,701
Peru	32,170		
Portugal	168,765	63,368	4,647

¹ Included in domestic.

Names of countries.	Domestic service, number of parcels.	Number of foreign parcels—	
		Received.	Dispatched.
Roumania	59,041	526,658	93,109
Russia	1,005,916	264,211	55,456
Siam	1,633	1,822	606
Spain		260,072	80,566
Sweden	591,009	218,450	57,544
Switzerland	13,827,846	2,535,712	1,432,676
Tunis	42,588	118,331	19,918
United Kingdom	65,783,018	1,042,348	1,206,364
Uruguay	5,085	6,942	1,720
British colonies, Australia:			
New South Wales	439,181	57,909	57,321
New Zealand	165,186	27,044	58,541
Victoria	187,143	33,744	50,784
Cape Colony	613,720	64,704	17,407
Cyprus	2,349	2,522	811
Danish West Indies	801	1,796	459
French colonies:			
Annam-Tonkin	9,631	10,985	7,943
Cochin, Cambodia, Bas Laos	7,439	5,343	2,211
Kongo	23		88
Ivory coast		1,123	163
Dahomey		784	87
Guiana		5,609	357
India			336
New Caledonia		2,661	344
Oceania—			
1896		569	80
1897		655	61
St. Pierre et Miquelon		2,669	66
Senegal	406	12,199	2,480
Dutch colonies:			
Curaçao		715	68
India	114,244	39,913	9,402
Surinam		1,608	765
Total	329,466,840	26,014,549	22,022,556
Total received	26,014,549		
Total dispatched	22,022,556		
Total of all parcels	374,503,894		

FOREIGN MARKETS.

So long as our Government fails to take hold of this question in earnest and force to a successful conclusion parcels-post conventions with all the foreign governments, and so long as the domestic parcels post shall be delayed, so long will the commercial and manufacturing interests of the United States and the common convenience of its people await complete development.

We were told in one mighty breath during the political campaign just closed, and it is generally believed by the people of this country as being true, that we now have a postal system that is superior to that of any other country on the globe; but they failed to give us any information about the great good that would result from a quick and cheap package communication, neither did they enlighten us as to why such a great trade promoter has been withheld from the people of the United States.

They told us of the untold wealth awaiting us and the distant peoples who want our goods, yet they failed to tell us why we have not long ago invaded these markets that stand with outstretched arms awaiting our coming. We have the goods, and better goods, but we lack the means of putting them on these markets in competition with foreign merchants, whose unsurpassed trade facilities beget our astonished admiration.

I was recently informed by the Second Assistant Postmaster-General that the policy of the Department in entering into parcels-post conventions with the small Central and South American republics, while refusing to conclude them with the great European governments, from whom we would reap a much greater benefit, were due to the fact that these treaties were executed in the spirit of the Monroe doctrine, and hence were looked upon as being governmental acts of grace and charity to benefit and develop these southern countries.

Such paternal solicitude in behalf of our weak neighboring republics is well and good, but we should remember the old saying that "charity begins at home," and also give a helping hand to those interests of the United States which are struggling for a foothold in many markets of the world, and which must exert every faculty to keep up with European competition by reason of our competitors enjoying a foreign parcels post while we do not.

The Hon. GEORGE EDMUND FOSS, acting chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, United States House of Representatives, in a recent speech on the subject of the Navy, said: "We are building the Navy for commerce," and "the watchword of the coming century is 'commerce.'" Mr. Foss said: "We will seek the markets of the Orient," and "the Navy will play an important part;" but amid these optimistic commercial prognostications Mr. Foss did not tell us how our goods are to get to these distant markets and be sold in competition with goods offered at half the price we can afford to sell for. The goods, indeed, we could make and sell quite as cheaply as our alert rivals were we not obliged, on account of our having no parcels post such as they have, to pay 300 per cent or more than they for transportation.

OBJECTIONS TO THE PARCELS POST.

Having considered reasons for the adoption of both branches of the parcels post, let us now look at some of the objections that have been offered by those who are opposed to its adoption. No great reform has ever been without its opponents, and this is also true in respect to the parcels post.

We are informed by the gentlemen opposed to a domestic parcels post that there is a reason why it is such a benefit to the people of Europe which is not applied to America. We are told that it is owing to the absence of private express companies such as are in operation throughout the United States, and the resulting restricted facilities for package communication, that the parcels post is there such a popular and profitable system.

Just how much weight should be given to such a statement by an evenly balanced mind can easily be determined after considering the enormous benefits that accrue to the people of Europe by reason of their being able to receive and send their packages from the larger number of post-offices instead of from the smaller number of railroad stations, as is the case here in the United States, as well as a careful comparison of the respective package transportation rates of Europe and America. It will be clearly seen that a

vast difference exists in favor of the parcels post as the cheapest, most rapid, and satisfactory method of parcels transportation. No wonder, then, that there has never been a chance for private express companies to get a hold in European countries.

Yet, in the face of this unanswerable logic of dollars and cents and years of practical business experience, there are those who say it is questionable whether America would find in such a system the economy which Europe reaps. This is the same argument which was used against the reduction of letter postage. When England reduced her letter postage to 1 penny per letter, Lord Litchfield stated in the House of Lords that "of all the wild and visionary schemes I have ever heard or read, this is the most extraordinary." To which Lord Ashburton, in replying, said, "The noble earl, like all post-masters-general, seems to look more to the increase of revenue than to the general convenience of the public." No one will now say that it was a mistake to reduce the postage for letters. Neither will it be a mistake to grant a liberal parcels post, as it will prove as great, or even greater, convenience and saving to the people than the reduction of letter postage.

There can be no doubt that once public sentiment has been thoroughly aroused on this subject and our people come to understand the many virtues of this system of posts and the great benefits it will bring to all, real opposition to its immediate introduction will vanish like dew beneath the morning sun. Lincoln's words, "You can't fool the people all the time," will prove themselves true once more, when the public understand that the only real opponents of a domestic parcels post are a few persons mercenarily opposing the general good. Encouraged by the success of their previous efforts along this line, they unblushingly assert the public to be their legitimate prey and become indignant that anyone should seriously urge the adoption of a domestic parcels post.

In a recent address before the National Association of Merchants and Travelers, in Chicago, Mr. Louis M. Boswell, an opponent of the domestic parcels post, who, by the way, is the commissioner of a large western freight bureau, said:

"Every pound of freight to be transported is the legitimate source of revenue to the railroads. Freight should be transported as such by railroad companies in freight cars, and not by the Government as mail matter in mail cars."

In justice to the railroads in general, be it said, they do not seriously oppose the adoption of a domestic parcels post. The vice-president of "one of the leading Western railroads" is quoted as saying:

"I have long regarded the express companies as unnecessary middlemen. To me there seems no good reason why the railroads should not do a large share of the business which is now done by the express companies. Millions of dollars would be saved annually to the public if the express companies were done away with, and I do not believe the revenues of the railroads would be decreased."

It is not the direct or remote object of the supporters of a domestic parcels post to establish a public express company for the transportation of any and all kinds of packages. The idea of the adherents of a domestic parcels post is the enlargement of the functions of the mail service to include the transportation of packages of a reasonable bulk and weight, which can be done with ease, facility, and profit.

The objection most noisily dwelt upon by the anti-domestic parcels-post faction is that the adoption of this system would open to the large business houses of the cities the opportunity to conduct a mail-order business in all that territory which has hitherto remained the undisturbed field of the local or rural merchant. Their sole desire is evidently to prevent the slightest infringement of their personal interests, regardless of what such reforms would accomplish for the general good. In the address to which I have already referred as having been delivered before the National Association of Merchants and Travelers, Mr. Boswell said:

"It would be a fine thing for the Eastern merchant to have a parcels-post system whereby he could supply the people throughout the country and partake of trade which he could not otherwise secure, but wherein would the Western merchant be the gainer? What encouragement would there then be to the Western merchant to keep up fine stocks and have an extensive variety in his store?"

Note that Mr. Boswell makes no effort to disguise his question or confine his argument to legitimate merits, but plainly asks: "Wherein would the Western merchant be the gainer?" He, and he alone, is to be maintained even at the expense and sacrifice of every other interest.

A clipping from a Western trade journal, in an article addressed to rural merchants, reads in part:

"And what are you on earth for if not to look out for your own interests? * * * A parcels-post bill will doubtless be brought up in the next Congress. If it passes * * * they will make prices that will knock your business silly. * * * You are the one entitled to the trade of your town and neighborhood."

These statements are not only unwarranted and uncalled for, but are based on no foundation of fact. They are apt to create prejudice and engender a commercial spirit of sectional animosity. It is to be deprecated that intelligent and responsible men should resort to such shallow subterfuges to retard the advance of such a meritorious postal reform. The employment of such means but indicates that the opposition is in its last ditch, the skulking traducer of an honest reform.

It can not be denied that a parcels post, either domestic or foreign, will bring consumer and manufacturer closer together; that is its object. But I deny that it will obliterate the country merchant from the mercantile world. On the contrary, it will increase his sphere of usefulness and make his business of greater importance to his neighborhood. Those who are acquainted with rural stores have some conception of the variety of goods they contain, and all realize the fact that the larger the variety of goods carried in stock the greater the usefulness of that merchant to the community. The existing methods of transportation make it impossible for the rural merchant North, South, East, or West to procure goods with any degree of profit unless he obtains them in large bulk. To do this he must not only have the money with which to purchase, but must also have the store space in which to display his stock to good advantage. To the average rural merchant these necessities are generally lacking.

With the adoption of a domestic parcels post these same merchants, with the outlay of less capital and without the need of larger store space, could carry a greater variety of stock in small lots, with the knowledge that the moment an article was in danger of exhaustion his stock could be replenished without long delay or excessive cost for transportation. This presents a feature in the domestic parcels post so beneficial to the rural merchants that they will not be unmindful of the vast advantage it will prove to them. It would practically transfer the burden of carrying stock from the back of the retail merchant to that of the wholesale or manufacturing house, from there to be let out to the retailer as needed. This condition would increase and stimulate his business to an unprecedented degree.

Wholesale or manufacturing houses will never sell to the consumer at the same figure at which they sell to the merchant. The merchant is generally able to buy at a price anywhere from 20 to 60 per cent lower than the customer buying direct, the greater the quantity the greater the discount. For illustration, let us consider that the domestic parcels post is in full operation

throughout the United States, and that John Smith, a resident of a far Western or Southern rural community, after having read a newspaper advertisement, desires to buy a small household article manufactured by a California house. He finds that his own rural store does not keep this article, but the merchant to whom he communicates his desire requests that he be permitted to order it for him, as he can save him money. Smith is a little skeptical as to whether he will get what he has seen advertised as well through the merchant as he will by buying direct, but the storekeeper allays his mind on that score by giving him the following practical talk:

"You want the article referred to here in this advertisement. Its price is \$1."

"Yes, sir."

"Its weight, sent by parcels post, is given as 1 pound, which makes the transportation charges 6 cents (the English postage rate)."

"Yes."

"Then it will cost you \$1.06, will it not?"

"Yes."

"Now, I can save you money on that article, for I can purchase it for less than you can. As I am a merchant, I can get it at 40 per cent discount, or for 60 cents, hence making it cost me just 60 cents plus the parcels-post charges, 6 cents. I can sell it to you for \$1, which is less than you can purchase it yourself, save you the trouble of writing, and at the same time make 34 cents profit for myself."

"But I can do even better than that. I believe a few of these articles will sell well in this neighborhood. I will get a half a dozen of them. I can get a half a dozen at 50 per cent discount. The transportation of them by parcels post will cost 18 cents; consequently, they will cost me just \$3.18. That will permit me to put in my pocket a nice profit of \$2.18, or nearly 100 per cent on the money invested. You therefore see that, besides patronizing your home merchant, you actually save money for yourself."

The moral in this hypothetical case is obvious. This merchant, looking retrospectively (at that time), might also say:

"This I could not do had not the domestic parcels post come into operation. Under the old transportation system (mail) I would have had to pay 16 cents per pound, and as they then carried no packages of merchandise above 4 pounds I could not have ordered the six articles by mail. The same articles by express would have cost for the one 35 cents, for the six \$1.15. By freight the minimum charges would have been for 100 pounds, no matter what the actual weight might be, and then there would have been a question whether you would have gotten the article in time for this or next season's use."

It is no wonder the private transportation companies, who constitute the backbone of the anti-domestic parcels-post faction, should raise such an energetic protest against its adoption; but the monstrous audacity they exhibit in calling to their assistance the very commercial interests they ravish by their arbitrary dealings is an amazing piece of unprecedented effrontery. They know full well the rural merchants form a large percentage of their carrying trade, and so long as the present means of transportation remain in statu quo they can continue their legalized plundering with the impunity of a Mediterranean pirate. They also know that just as soon as a domestic parcels post makes its appearance their plundering must cease. They know that it is only a matter of a short time when the domestic parcels post will be an established fact. In their desperate situation, having no valid reason with which to ward off its coming, they shout the bugaboo of "large mail-order houses" in a vain attempt to "rally India for the subjection of India." However, that wide-awake and progressive class of gentlemen who constitute our smaller commercial interests will not be deluded by the falsity and imposture of such a cry, and will carefully sift the chaff from the wheat ere they take action that will "again curse the serpent that once struck them."

THE POSTAL DEFICIT.

One of the arguments that is being used with much gusto by those opposed to a domestic parcels post is the fact that there is already a large annual deficit in the Post-Office revenues, which, it is claimed, would be greatly increased by the adoption of the proposed system. That there is a present deficiency there can be no doubt; but that this deficiency would be increased by the inauguration of a domestic parcels post is a misdirection of sequences. I believe a complete system of foreign and domestic parcels post to be the proper remedy for our present annual deficit of over \$3,600,000, and that it would soon place our Post-Office Department on a self-sustaining and profit-paying basis. In support of this contention I cite the experience of foreign governments. In Germany, for example, they handle over 150,000,000 packages in their domestic parcels post alone. This means an average of about three packages to each man, woman, and child in Germany. The average weight per package was 9 pounds.

Let us apply these figures to the United States. As we now have a population of over 76,000,000 people, we would handle 238,000,000 packages. At the English rate of postage, the Post-Office Department would receive \$50,100,000. The cost of transportation to the Government would be 55 per cent, or \$27,585,000. This would leave 45 per cent, or \$22,515,000, from which to deduct the increased cost to the Government for handling the same. The balance would be clear profit. But this is not all. Nearly a hundred million of dollars would be saved to the people in actual cash—the difference between the small cost for postage and the large charges that would have to be paid to some private express company—to say nothing of the saving in time, expense, and trouble to the people in being able to receive their packages at their post-offices rather than at some distant express office.

In addition to this there would be a large profit to the people of this country by reason of a large balance of trade in our favor resulting from the exports, based on the experiences of both England and Germany, which would amount to over \$60,000,000.

AS TO COMMUNITY OF INTEREST.

In opposition to a domestic parcels post some effort has been made to discuss the subject of "community of interest" and the chances of local patronage going to points outside the community. The vital antagonistic principle of a "community of interest," i. e., commercial impoverishment without commercial nourishment, is not involved; and the effort to ascribe to it a stupendous "centralization of trade" is equally fallacious. The Constitution of the United States gives to Congress the sole power to regulate commerce between the several States. This virtually decrees the "community of interest" to be in the nation, and not in the State or locality. Therefore any attempt to involve the question of State as against State, or section against section, or locality against locality, or the establishment of internal "Chinese (trade) walls," is an assault against national unity and harmony. There must be no restrictions on commerce or intercourse between the several States, as they must unitedly and in common achieve their joint destiny.

Why are the opponents of a domestic parcels post so anxious to protect the rural merchant from the large American merchants? It seems to me that it would be more patriotic to urge both a domestic and foreign parcels post, so that both the rural and city merchants of this country can get to the home and foreign markets as cheaply as the German and Mexican merchants. The German and Mexican exporters now have access to all parts of the United States at rates for transportation vastly lower than is enjoyed by the American manufacturer himself. That such a condition exists when our

Government by a word could change it, savors of official discrimination against the American manufacturer in favor of the foreigner, and offers to the foreigner every inducement to supersede the domestic merchant in his home market. Our Government officials should not rest until they have placed at the disposal of the American people as good, if not better, parcels-post facilities and rates, both at home and abroad, as those enjoyed by our keenest trade competitors for the world's commerce.

NEWSPAPER OPINION.

That great public benefactor, "the press," has not been slow to see that a complete system of both domestic and foreign parcels post is a national necessity, and to it we owe many thanks for what has been done in behalf of this meritorious postal reform. The newspapers, magazines, and periodicals of the country will become to a much greater extent the means that will be used by manufacturers and commercial houses to advertise their goods when the domestic parcels post comes into popular use. When this much desired end is reached, we may look for a still deeper knitting together of the threads of internal commerce until the smaller articles of commerce may be as readily received at any post-office in any part of the United States as they now are in the large cities or at the place of origin.

EVIDENT RESULTS.

The evident results of the policy now being pursued by the United States Government, with reference to a foreign parcels post, is bound to injuriously affect all our commercial interests until this policy is changed. Of the European countries, Great Britain, France, Belgium, Norway, and others have been seeking parcels-post conventions with us, but to no avail. Mexico, our "natural and political ally and sister republic," and our great Central American friend, enjoys a parcels-post convention with us it is true; but it costs us 74 cents more to send an 11-pound package to Mexico than our German rival and 48 cents more for each 11-pound package than our English competitors. Is it at all strange that the Mexican merchant prefers to buy from Germany or England, where he can buy so much cheaper? Give us the same transportation rates, and you will see that we will outsell the European in Mexico.

With Brazil, also a sister republic and our traditional friend, we have no parcels-post convention whatever. To what is this due? Such a condition is not evidence of official progress in assisting the American merchant to "conquer the markets of the world." The late James G. Blaine said the pressing question in our foreign trade was, "How can you bring seller and buyer together?" He further said, "They do not really know in Brazil what we have to sell and what we are able to manufacture and offer them." These words, so pregnant with instructive warning, uttered nearly a quarter of a century ago by a man devoted to American interests, have never been acted upon, and to-day we are as apathetic as ever, while the progressive European governments reap rich harvests at our very door.

As an object lesson of the self-harm we are doing in neglecting the expedients for trade development resorted to by foreign governments, I quote from a United States Government report—the Monthly Summary of Commerce and Finance—for June, 1899:

"In 1897 Brazil imported goods to the value of over \$105,000,000, of which the United States supplied but about 12 per cent; Uruguay and Paraguay, \$22,000,000, of which 7 per cent was from the United States; the Argentine Republic, \$95,000,000, of which less than 7 per cent was from the United States. On the Pacific coast the importations into Chile were valued at \$24,000,000; Peru, \$8,500,000; Bolivia, \$11,600,000; Ecuador, \$7,000,000, the proportion from the United States being but 10 per cent. Thus the northern coast of South America imported goods to the value of \$36,000,000, of which the United States supplies 25 per cent, the eastern coast \$222,000,000, and the western coast \$51,000,000, the proportion from the United States on each coast being about 10 per cent."

This same Government report also says:

"While exports from the United States to Mexico have grown rapidly, especially since the opening of railway communication, and have experienced a moderate development in the case of the countries bordering upon the Caribbean Sea, the total sales to the countries south of us have not grown with the rapidity which has characterized those of the world at large. In 1865 our sales to the countries lying south of us were 20 per cent of our total exports; in 1878, a little less than 10 per cent; in 1888, a fraction above 10 per cent, and in 1898 but 7 per cent of our total exports."

This commercial treatment of these South American countries in strangling the only feasible means of cheap and efficient package communication is, as we see, obviously designed to create the very condition we have labored to prevent. These countries are driven to commercial dealings with Europe that sooner or later result in strong commercial and social attachments. Their financial interests become centered in Europe, they come under European influence, acquire European habits, sentiments, and ideas which finally develop into a disregard and aversion for the independent American customs we have labored so long to perpetuate, all of which is antagonistic to that great western bicontinental community of interest the foundation of which is the Monroe doctrine.

In order to obtain a better idea of the workings of the Mexican foreign parcels post, I recently made a trip to the City of Mexico. While en route on a mail steamer I was forcibly struck by the parcels-post communication between this country and Progreso and Campeche, small coast towns in Yucatan, where our steamer called to let off mail, freight, and passengers. I saw thousands of packages in the post-office at Vera Cruz from all parts of Europe. The European is not slow to grasp the benefits of this means of parcels communication, and seems to be using it with good effect. Germany, in particular, was well represented, the number of her packages being far in excess of those from the United States, which shows that American enterprise is not without successful rivals at the very borders of our own country.

While in the City of Mexico I sent to my address in the United States a small parcel weighing 3 pounds. The postage on this parcel was 36 cents, Mexican money, the equivalent of 18 cents, United States money. Had I wished to send the same package from Washington, D. C., the capital of the nation, to the city of New York, the cheapest rate I could have obtained would have been 25 cents. Thus you can see a Mexican can ship to any United States post-office by mail cheaper than we can send the same article to any place in the United States either by mail or by private express company. The injustice to the domestic sender under such a situation is self-evident and but another living argument for the establishment of a domestic and foreign parcels post.

It is the unfortunate truth that our commercial and manufacturing industries that seek a world-wide market pay dearly for their Americanism. These industries could locate in a foreign country and obtain the parcels transportation rates afforded by those governments to great financial advantage. Their patriotism, however, is too strong for that, and they remain and pay those excessive charges, suffer the injustice of governmental apathy and the wasting of business vitality that it may never be said that alien soil obtained them for a price.

We have the right to expect that our Government will do everything in its power to provide for our exporters the same or even better facilities, so far as package transportation by foreign parcels post is concerned, than is now enjoyed by our ever-alert rivals. It is not generally understood, but it is a fact, that in all these foreign parcels-post conventions that the country in

which the shipment of the package originates retains the entire charge for the postage. For example, take an 11-pound package that is sent from the United States to Mexico; the postage on the same will be \$1.32. This entire amount goes to the United States Treasury. Our Government conveys the package to the Mexican border, and from there the Mexican Government takes the package to its destination without receiving further pay from the United States Government than the reciprocal privilege of retaining the entire postage charges on such packages as are sent into the United States from Mexico, the United States Government receiving and forwarding the package from the Mexican border to its destination in the United States.

The same arrangement is followed out in all parcels-post conventions. In a great commercial country like the United States, where the balance of trade is greatly in our favor, we have everything to gain by such an arrangement, and it seems to me that our post-office officials should need no urging to give us the lowest possible rates, for, with lower rates to the post-offices of the world, what have we to fear from foreign rivals? It is only while we are handicapped by excessive transportation charges that we really fear competition.

By a careful study of the foregoing table, that shows the number of packages imported into the various countries, in connection with the following table, showing the comparative rates of postage, it will be seen that Germany has been most liberal in giving her manufacturers, merchants, and people the cheapest possible rates—13 cents for 11 pounds—to the neighboring country, Austria-Hungary. Note the results: Austria-Hungary leads the world in the number of packages imported, and Germany leads the world in the number of packages exported. This wise and farseeing policy of the German Government in looking more to facilitating her export trade than in increasing her postal revenues has caused the hum of the workshops and factories of Germany to be heard around the world, many of them making imitation American goods to be sold on the demand we have created but can not supply because the German Government is wise enough to give its people cheap postage transportation, both at home and abroad.

Contrast this policy with our own. Take Mexico for example: Our postal officials, looking for postal revenue instead of commercial extension, compel us to pay \$1.32 for an 11-pound package for Mexico, while England and Germany, located on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean, given their people a rate for an 11-pound package of only 84 cents and 58 cents, respectively. Is it strange that Europe dominates the markets of Mexico?

What would be the results if our Government should wake up and, as a matter of commercial strategy give us the same rate to Mexico that Germany gives to Austria-Hungary, viz, 13 cents per an 11-pound package? Do you believe that Europe would long be a successful competitor in the smaller articles of commerce? If it would work well with Mexico, why not extend these cheap transportation rates to other countries?

The following table will prove both interesting and instructive to those interested in the foreign commerce of the United States. The facts are compiled from the latest obtainable foreign and domestic Government and private publications. The figures are reduced to United States money. In comparing the postage rates with private transportation companies' rates, it should always be borne in mind that wherever a rate is given by a private transportation company it is intended for railroad stations or coast port towns only, while all the parcels-post rates take the package to the post-office of the party addressed. It often costs the resident of a foreign country more to get a package to his residence from the railroad or coast town, where it has been left at his risk and cost by the private transportation company, than from America to this same coast or railroad town.

It is not strange that the foreign importer prefers to receive his packages from an exporter who can send them by parcels post, which not only delivers the same at his post-office, not only saving him the trouble and expense above referred to, but also saving the expense of port fees, custom-house brokerage, etc.

In consulting the following table it should be borne in mind that the private express companies' charges mentioned therein are from Washington, D. C. If from other parts of the United States, the charge from point of origin to New York must be added to the rate mentioned in the table. Also remember that where no rate is given that there was either no service to be had if by parcels post or no rate to be obtained if by private express company. Table showing the postage charges on 11-pound packages when sent by parcels post from England, Germany, Mexico, and the United States (when this can be done) to the various countries and colonies of the world; also showing the charges on the same packages, for transportation alone, when sent from Washington, D. C., by private express companies.

Country.	By parcels post from—			Express charges when sent from Washington, D. C.	By parcels post from United States.
	Eng-land.	Ger-many.	Mex-ico.		
Aden, British	\$1.20	\$0.83	\$0.90	\$4.00
Afghanistan	1.34
Algeria, French62	.30	.40	3.50
Ambriz, West Africa, Portugal98	.39
Amoy, China	1.10	.93	.71	3.50
Angola, West Africa, Portugal88	.70	5.00
Annam, French China	1.12	.88	.70
Antigua, Leeward Islands, British
West Indies	1.54	1.22	.70	2.65	\$1.32
Arabia	1.20	.97	.70
Argentina	1.16	.73	.58	4.50
Ascension Island, South Atlantic, British	1.76	1.41	.58
Australia, Central or South, British	1.4497	3.25
Austria-Hungary56	.13	.35	2.25
Azores Islands, Portugal78	.53	.64
Bahama Islands, British West Indies	2.00	1.93	.58	3.80	1.32
Banks Islands, British	1.90	1.28
Barbados Islands, British West Indies	1.76	1.22	.70	2.65	1.32
Belgium	7.26	1.90	.98
Bechuanaland, Africa, British53	.20	.35	2.00
Benguela, West Africa, Portugal98	1.22
Berbera, North Africa, British	1.20
Bermuda Islands, British	1.98	1.41	.78	1.65
Beyroot, Syria, Turkey90	.54	.45	4.00
Bolama, West Africa, Portugal78
Bolivia	1.79	.75	4.75
Bosnia74	.13	.30	4.00
Brazil69	4.50

Table showing the postage charges on 11-pound packages, etc.—Continued.

Country.	By parcels post from—			Express charges when sent from Washington, D. C.	By parcels post from United States.
	Eng-land.	Ger-many.	Mex-ico.		
British Central Africa.....	\$3.96	\$1.41	\$0.58		
British East Africa.....	1.44	1.51			
British Guiana.....	1.80	1.61	.58	\$3.00	\$1.32
British Honduras.....	1.76	1.22	.58	3.40	1.32
British West Africa.....	1.98		.58		
Bulgaria.....	1.14	.73	.45	4.00	
Buena, British.....	1.20	1.02	.78		
Calenda, West Africa, Portugal.....	.98				
Cameroons, West Africa, German.....	.78	.30	.45		
Canada, British.....	1.36	1.25	.84		
Canary Islands, Spain.....		.54		5.00	
Canea, Turkey.....	.74	.30	.45	4.00	
Canton, China.....	1.10	.93	.71	3.50	
Cape Colony, British.....	1.98	1.90	.98	3.50	
Cape Verde Islands, Portugal.....	.78	.08	.55	5.00	
Ceylon, British.....	1.38	1.41	.70	3.50	
Chile.....	1.10	.78	.75	4.75	2.20
Cochin China, French.....	1.12	.88	.70		
Colombia, Republic of.....	1.44	.73	.63	5.00	1.32
Comoro Islands, French.....		.08	.60		
Congo Free State, Belgium.....	.82	.58	.55		
Constantinople, Turkey.....	.66	.44	.43	4.00	
Corea.....		1.47		4.75	
Corsica, French.....	.62	.29	.40		
Costa Rica.....	1.32	.58	.55	4.90	1.32
Crete, Turkey.....	.74	.39	.45	4.00	
Cuba.....		1.59		2.90	
Curacao, Dutch West Indies.....	1.08	.73	.63	2.90	
Cyprus, British.....	1.44	.68			
Dahomey, Africa, French.....	.94	.68	.55		
Delagoa Bay, East Africa, Portugal.....		.73		3.50	
Denmark.....	.58	.20	.35	2.20	
Dominica Island, British Leeward Islands.....	1.54	1.22	.70	2.65	1.32
Dutch East Indies.....	1.14	.93	.73		
Dutch Guiana.....	1.08	.67	.63	3.15	
Dutch West Indies.....	1.08	.58	.55		
Ecuador.....		3.04		5.90	1.32
Egypt.....	.78	.44	.45	3.50	
England.....	.24	.37	.42	1.50	
Eritrea, North Africa, Italy.....	.84	.64	.58		
Falkland Islands, British.....	1.98	1.22	.58		
Faroe Islands, Denmark.....	.58	.20	.35		
Fiji Islands, British.....	1.84	1.63	1.26		
Finland, Russia.....	.99	.65	.58	3.90	
Toochow, China.....	1.10	.93	.71	3.50	
Formosa, Japan.....		.93			
France.....	.58	.20	.30	2.25	
French Congo.....	.94	.68	.55		
French India.....		.68	.55		
French Guiana.....	.94	.68	.55	4.75	
French Guinea, Africa.....		.68	.55		
Gambia, Africa, British.....	1.08	1.22		5.00	
Germany.....	.48	.12	.30	1.75	1.32
German East Africa.....	1.20	.78	.75		
German Southwest Africa.....	1.24	.85			
Gibraltar, British.....	.96	.97	.70		
Grana Bassam, West Africa, French.....	.94	.39			
Greece.....	1.20	.36	.45	4.00	
Greenland, Denmark.....		.20			
Grenada, Windward Islands, British.....	1.76	1.22	.70	2.90	1.32
Guadeloupe Island, West Indies, French.....	.94	.68	.55	2.65	
Guatemala.....		.83	.68	4.90	1.32
Guinea, Africa, Portugal.....		.55	.68	5.00	
Haiti.....		1.59		3.25	
Hankow, China.....	1.10	.93	.71		
Hawaii.....	2.64	2.33	1.50		1.32
Heligoland, German.....	.48	.12			
Herzegovina.....	.74	.30			
Hokow, China.....	1.10	.93	.71		
Holland.....	.54	.20	.35	2.00	
Honduras, Republic of.....	1.36	.78	.75	4.90	1.32
Hongkong, China, British.....	1.38	.88	1.03	3.25	
Iceland.....	.58	.20			
India, British.....	1.20	1.02	.70	3.00	
Italy.....	.60	.34	.43	2.70	
Ivory Coast, Africa, French.....	.94	.68	.55		
Jamaica, British.....	1.98	1.22	.70	2.90	1.32
Janina, Turkey.....	.74	.39		4.00	
Japan.....	1.24	.93	.97	3.24	
Java, Holland.....	1.14	.93			
Jerusalem, Turkey.....	.74	.39	.45	4.00	
Kiung Chow, China.....		.92	.75		
Labuan Island, British.....	1.82	1.61	1.13		
Lagos, Africa, British.....	1.98	1.22	.58		
Legos, Turkey.....	.74	.39	.45	4.00	
Leeward Islands, British.....	1.54	1.22	.70		
Liberia.....	1.24	.44	.48	5.00	
Loanda, West Africa, Portugal.....	.98	.39			
Luxemburg.....	.48	.17	.38		
Macao, China.....	1.10	.78	.71		
Madagascar, French.....	.94	.68	.55	5.00	
Madagascar Islands, Portugal.....	.68	.44	.45	5.00	
Malay Peninsula.....	1.38				
Malta, British.....	.96	.49	.43	4.00	
Marshall Islands.....		1.71			
Martinique Island, French.....	.94	.68	.55	2.65	
Mashonaland, Africa, British.....	7.20	2.35			
Matabeleland, Africa, British.....	7.20	2.35			
Mauritius Island, French.....	.96	.68			

Table showing the postage charges on 11-pound packages, etc.—Continued.

Country.	By parcels post from—			Express charges when sent from Washington, D. C.	By parcels post from United States.
	Eng-land.	Ger-many.	Mex-ico.		
Mayotte Island, French.....	\$0.94	\$0.68	\$0.55		
Mexico.....	.84	.58	.60		\$1.32
Miguelon Island, French.....	.72	.78	.70		
Moluccas, Dutch East Indies.....	1.14	.93	.70		
Mombasa, East Africa, British.....	1.44	2.19			
Monaco.....	.52	.20			
Montenegro.....	.78	.39	.45	\$4.00	
Montserrat Island, Leeward Islands, British.....	1.54	1.22	.70	2.65	1.32
Morocco.....	.64	.39	.40	3.50	
Mossamedes, West Africa, Portugal.....		.98	1.22		
Mytilene, Turkey.....	.74	.39		4.00	
Natal.....	1.98	1.68	.98		
Nevis Island, Leeward Islands, British.....	1.54	1.22	.70	1.32	
New Caledonia, French.....	1.12	.88	.65		
Newfoundland, British.....	1.38	1.42	.58	1.32	
New Guinea, British.....	1.44	1.68	1.16		
New Guinea, German.....	1.16	.78	.75		
New Hebrides, British.....	1.16	1.90	1.28		
New South Wales, British.....	1.44	1.27	.97	3.25	
New Zealand, British.....	1.44	1.68	1.16	3.75	1.32
Nicaragua.....		.68	.60	4.90	1.32
Niger Coast, Protectorate, British.....	1.98	.39	.58		
Ningpo, China.....	1.10	.93	.71		
Norfolk Island, British.....	1.44	1.27			
Norway.....	.50	.25	.38	2.20	
Novi-Bazar, Turkey.....	.74	.30		4.00	
Novo Redondo, West Africa, Portugal.....	.98				
Nyasaland, Africa, British.....	3.96				
Obock, Africa, French.....	.74	.49	.45		
Oil River, Africa, British.....	1.98				
Orange Free State.....	2.64	1.90	1.28		
Paraguay.....	1.10	1.55	.75	4.50	
Patagonia.....		1.22			
Persia.....	2.53	2.75	1.87		
Peru.....	1.80	.92	.73	5.50	
Philippines.....		1.83		5.90	
Porto Rico.....		1.83		3.10	
Portugal.....	.58	.44	.45	2.75	
Queensland, British.....	1.44	1.68	.97	3.50	
Ratonga, Cooks Island, British.....	2.28	2.16	1.40		
Retimo, Turkey.....	.74	.39		4.00	
Reunion Island, French.....	.94	.68	.55		
Rhodes, Turkey.....	.74	.39	.45	4.00	
Rhodesia, British.....	7.20	2.35	.98		
Roumania.....	.72	.34	.43	4.00	
Russia.....		.34	.43	3.90	
St. Croix Island, Dutch West Indies.....	1.02	.59		2.65	1.32
St. Helena, British.....	1.76	1.41	.58	5.00	
St. John Island, Dutch West Indies.....	1.02				1.32
St. Kitts Island, British Leeward Islands.....	1.54	1.22	.70	2.65	1.32
St. Pierre Island, French.....	.72	.78	.70		
St. Lucia Island, Windward Islands, British.....	1.76	1.22	.70	2.65	1.32
St. Martin Island, Dutch West Indies.....	1.08	.73			
St. Thomas Island, Dutch West Indies.....	1.02	.58	.55	2.65	1.32
St. Thomas Island, Africa, Portugal.....	.98	.88	.70		
St. Vincent Island, Windward Islands, British.....	1.54	1.22	.70	2.65	1.32
St. Vincent Island, Portugal, South Atlantic.....	.78	.68			
Salonica, Turkey.....	.74	.39	.45	4.00	
Salvador.....	1.68	.73	.63	4.90	1.32
Samoa.....	1.16	.78	.75		
Santo Domingo.....		1.59		2.65	
San Juan Island, Dutch West Indies.....			.55		
Santa Cruz Island, British.....		1.90	1.28		
Santiago Island, Portugal, South Atlantic.....	.78				
Sarawak (North Borneo), British.....	1.82	1.61	.70		
Senegal, Africa, French.....	.74	.49	.45		
Serbia.....	.68	.29	.40	4.00	
Seychelles Islands, British.....	.96	1.12	.58		
Shanghai, China.....	1.10	.78	.70	3.25	
Siam.....	1.44	1.07	.88		
Siberia.....		.97		4.75	
Sierra Leone.....	1.98	1.22	.58	5.00	
Singapore.....		.93	.70		
Smyrna, Turkey.....	.42	.39		4.00	
South Australia.....	1.44	1.66			
Soudan, German.....			.75		
Spain.....	1.02	.57	.65	2.75	
Straits Settlements.....	1.38	.93	.70	3.50	
Sumatra.....	1.14	.93			
Swatow, China.....	1.10	.93	.71		
Sweden.....	.70	.39	.45	2.80	
Switzerland.....	.58	.20	.35	2.00	
Tahiti (South Sea).....	1.52	1.27	.70		
Tangier.....	1.16		.45		
Tasmania.....	1.44	1.56	.97	3.50	
Tientsin, China.....		.78	.75		
Tobago Island, British West Indies.....	1.78	1.22	.70	4.00	

Table showing the postage charges on 11-pound packages, etc.—Continued.

Country.	By parcels post from—			Express charges when sent from Washington, D. C.	By parcels post from United States.
	Eng-land.	Ger-many.	Mex-ico.		
Togoland, Africa, German.	\$0.78	\$0.39	\$0.45		
Tonga Island (South Sea).....		1.71			
Tonkin.....	1.12	.88	.70		
Fortula Island, Leeward Islands.....	1.54	1.22	.70		
Transvaal.....	2.04	1.90	.28	\$4.25	
Trebizond, Turkey.....	.74	.39	.45	4.00	
Trinidad Island, British West Indies.....	1.70	1.22	.70	2.75	\$1.32
Tripoli, Africa.....	.40	.39	.40	3.50	
Tripoli Syria, Turkey.....	.74	.49	.50	4.00	
Tristan da Cunha Islands, British.....	1.70				
Tsintan, China.....		.78			
Tunis.....	.74	.44	.43	3.50	
Turks Island, British West Indies.....	1.98				
Turkey.....	.74	.44	.45	4.00	
United States.....		.58	.66		
Uruguay.....	1.08	.73	.73	4.50	
Venezuela.....	1.54	1.22	.63	5.00	1.32
Victoria.....	1.44	1.44	.97	3.25	
Western Australia.....	1.44	1.08	.97		
Windward Islands.....					1.32
Zaila, Africa, British.....	1.20			4.00	
Zanzibar, British.....	1.44	.68	.60		
Zululand.....	1.98	1.68			

OUTWITTED BY FOREIGNERS.

The story comes from a reliable source about two prominent United States post-office officials who this spring made a tour to inspect the postal systems of some European countries, how while abroad they visited a country which had made a number of efforts through these same officials to conclude a parcels-post convention with the United States, but with no success. They were greatly surprised to behold in a post-office in that country a placard announcing that packages would be received for transmission to the United States by mail. They made up a package and posted it, and when they returned to the United States the package awaited them. An investigation revealed the fact that there was a combination between this foreign country and a private express company in the United States by which this company delivered in the United States packages transferred to it at a foreign seaport. By this arrangement this foreign country is to-day enabled to place its goods in any part of the United States at an insignificant cost, while we, on the other hand, are unable to send our goods there by parcels post, and are obliged to pay the extremely high figures extorted from us by ocean express companies.

For years before the German Government was able to induce our postal officials to conclude a parcels-post convention with her she published in a large Government publication, devoted to giving the transportation rates for parcels posts to foreign countries, a schedule of charges on packages sent by mail to each State and Territory in the United States. Packages thus sent were taken by the German mail steamers to New York City, consigned to a German representative, and by him reshipped by private express companies to the nearest railroad station of the party for whom the package was intended, at prices as cheap or cheaper for transportation in the United States as those "enjoyed" by our own people.

It is needless, however, to say that the American shipper had no such opportunity for cheap transportation to Germany until the present parcels-post arrangement went into effect with Germany. The one-sidedness and injustice of these conditions is apparent to even the ordinary observer, and is but a natural result of the attempt to stifle parcels communication by mail between intelligent and civilized nations.

NEED FOR UNITY OF ACTION.

It now seems that Congress should be earnestly importuned to establish a liberal domestic parcels post at an early date, and that the postal authorities should also be persistently urged to begin negotiations at once with every foreign government for the immediate inauguration of a foreign parcels post service with each respective government. A letter to President McKinley by the manufacturers and exporters, urging this action, would no doubt greatly hasten the early establishment of foreign parcels post with foreign governments. Those who are farsighted enough to see the good bound to arise from the consummation of the ends here sought should heartily join in putting their "shoulder to the wheel" for the general welfare. One common unity of action by those interested in the material development of our country may serve as an intimation to the proper authorities that the time has arrived when every voice is calling for both the domestic and foreign parcels post; and to that end let every business, commercial, and social organization petition or memorialize their Representatives and Senators to do what they can for the institution of this system, and let every voter see that his Congressman knows his views and urge him to their enactment. This he can do by sending him a letter similar to the following:

—, 1900.

MY DEAR SIR: As I am one of your constituents, I take the liberty of addressing you upon a subject which is apt to engage your attention while discharging your Congressional duties.

I refer to the parcels post, and I wish to impress you with my sincere desire for its early adoption. To this end I trust you will give your hearty and cordial support and cooperation, with the result that we shall soon have a liberal system of both domestic and foreign parcels post in full operation.

Trusting that if the initiative along this line is not promptly taken by your colleagues you will do so yourself, I remain,

Yours, very truly,

CONVENTION WITH GERMANY.

Before I close I should like to register a protest against the conduct of our postal officials in agreeing to a parcels-post convention that is remarkable for its discrimination against the American exporter and the advantages given to his German rival. I have been informed that the Superintendent of our Bureau of Foreign Mails is responsible for the terms of this convention; also for the present unbusinesslike and un-American foreign parcels-post policy of the Post-Office Department.

I am not surprised that such a policy has not given great advantages to

the American exporter; in fact, I rather expected and looked for some such result, knowing the character of the men aiding and defending Germany's commercial growth and the high aims which animate them.

Our convention with Germany went into effect on the 1st day of October, 1899. The treaty provides that parcels sent from Germany may be transported at the rate of 1 mark and 60 pfennigs, which is 38 cents, when not weighing over 2.2 pounds, and for all parcels over that weight and not exceeding 11 pounds, 2 marks and 40 pfennigs, which is 58 cents. On the other hand, the American exporter must pay 12 cents per pound straight. The receiver of the parcel in each country pays a "delivery fee" of an amount equal to 5 cents.

As an example of the practical workings of this system of charges, let us examine the German and American cost of the sending of an 11-pound package. The cost from any post-office in Germany for its transportation to any post-office in the United States will be 58 cents and a "delivery fee" of 5 cents, making a total of 63 cents. The cost from any post-office in the United States to any post-office in the German Empire, for its transportation, will be \$1.32 and a "delivery fee" of 5 cents, making a total of \$1.37. A little calculation will therefore show that under this treaty the American exporter of an 11-pound package of merchandise really pays over 100 per cent more for its transportation than his German rival. This, too, while we are declaiming about the commercial supremacy of the world and the protection of American manufactures. Are we to understand by this treaty that an export tax is to be paid by the American exporter for the protection and benefit of his Teutonic competitor?

It should not be understood that American commercial interests do not desire or appreciate a parcels post treaty with Germany, for they do; but the point of their protest is the discriminatory rates between the citizens of the two countries, whereby the German obtains advantages far in excess of those afforded to the American. When questioned on this advantage permitted to the German, after discussing the rates, the Postmaster-General replied:

"It will be seen from the foregoing that senders in the United States have a decided advantage in the case of parcels not weighing more than 4 pounds; that the rates for 5 pound parcels are about equal, while senders in Germany have an advantage in the matter of parcels weighing over 5 pounds."

"The parcels post being intended to provide facilities for the exchange by mail of small parcels, for the transmission of which no provision is made in the regular mails exchanged with foreign governments, it is thought that the lower rates applicable in the United States to parcels weighing less than 5 pounds more than counterbalances any advantage that results from the lower rates applicable in Germany to parcels weighing 5 pounds or more."

This theoretical speculation as to the practical workings of this system of charges may look very well on paper, but a statement made by the head of the department having charge of the foreign parcels post of the business done under this system between this country and Germany from October 1, 1899, when this arrangement went into operation, up to June 30, 1900, the end of the last fiscal year, shows that we sent to Germany 16,247 parcels, while Germany sent here 26,659 packages. This balance of trade in favor of Germany is exactly what might have been expected as the natural result of such a system of transportation rates.

In the 1899 report of the Hon. Charles Emory Smith, Postmaster-General of the Post-Office Department, referring to the convention with Germany, we find the following:

"It will present the most important test which has yet been offered of the feasibility, efficiency, and cost of using the mails for the transmission of merchandise within limited weights, and the result of its practical operation will be carefully watched by the business community as bearing in the most significant way upon the further development of the system."

If we are to have a "test treaty" for the purpose of determining whether it would be expedient to enter into parcels-post conventions with other European countries, let it be a fair test and not such a one as is afforded by this convention with Germany, where manifestly every chance is against the American exporter and in favor of the German importer. Does not this smack of a cunning design by those opposed to the parcels post to procure a Government report against its expediency?

CONCLUSION.

Owing to the fact that advance copies of the annual report of the Superintendent of Foreign Mails have just been given to the press, in which he has treated the subject of parcels post at greater length and with more consideration than he has heretofore seen fit to accord it, I desire, before closing this article, to give him full credit for what he has said therein, by inserting in full that portion of his report devoted to foreign parcels post, and to charge him with what he has left unsaid upon this important subject. He says:

"There can be no doubt that the international parcels post is a great convenience to the citizens of the United States and of those countries with which we have the parcels-post service, as it enables them to exchange quickly, conveniently, and at a moderate cost packages of merchandise which are not allowed to be sent in the regular mails and which if regularly imported would be subjected to freight charges and consular and custom-brokers' fees to an amount which would be prohibitive."

"The great public convenience afforded by the parcels post is at once apparent when it is remembered that no provision is made for the transmission in the regular international mails of articles of miscellaneous merchandise, unless the articles are sent as bona fide trade samples, having no salable value, and unless they are not subject to the custom duties in the country for which they are destined. Packages addressed for delivery in a foreign country are accepted for mailing in the United States if postage thereon is prepaid in full at the letter rate of 5 cents a half ounce, for the reason that when letter postage is prepaid in full on a package the package is supposed to contain a letter, and for the further reason that the Department is not advised whether the articles inclosed are dutiable in the country to which the package is addressed. But the country is at liberty to return the packages to the United States as having been dispatched in contravention of the provision against the transmission in the international mails of articles having a salable value, or to seize them as violating its customs regulations, and for such return or seizure there is no redress. In these conditions the parcels post affords the only channel for the legitimate exchange of packages of miscellaneous merchandise by mail between different countries. It, in fact, gives to persons in different countries substantially the same facilities for the exchange of small parcels as is afforded in our domestic service by the provision for the admission to the mails of 'fourth-class matter.'"

It will be seen that some of these ideas are clothed in such ambiguous language that it is by no means easy to understand all that is written. One fact, however, stands out clearly, there are no recommendations of any kind.

Some of the conclusions we draw from this report are that the Post-Office Department practically admits that the present foreign transportation facilities for packages of merchandise without the parcels post are almost absolutely "prohibitive."

The last sentence of the report quoted above is misleading and inaccurate in the extreme. It gives the reader to understand that the United States has the most liberal postal arrangements of any country in the world for the transportation of packages of merchandise, and that when once the other countries of the world are so fortunate as to have secured parcels-post conventions, they will then, and not till then, be able to enjoy the same

extraordinary liberal and much to be desired postal facilities for the transmission of packages as is now enjoyed by the citizens of the United States, who are much to be envied in this special particular.

It is well known that a citizen of the United States can not send a package of merchandise through the United States mail that weighs over 4 pounds, and that the postage on such a package is 64 cents. It is also known that a resident of England can send a 4-pound package for 12 cents, and even an 11-pound package can be sent to any post-office in the United Kingdom for 24 cents; that a resident of Germany can send an 11-pound package to any post-office in the German Empire or in Austria-Hungary for 12 cents, and that in Switzerland an 11-pound package can go to any post-office in that Republic for only 8 cents.

I believe that I have thoroughly demonstrated the need of a domestic and foreign parcels post, and have impartially covered the serious objections offered to them. Again I wish to urge the need for one general and common unity of action. As we have outgrown the stagecoach and the horse car, so we have outgrown the arbitrary, extortionate, slow, and ill-equipped express companies which with antiquated systems hamper our whole commercial activity. We need cheaper, better, quicker systems, both internally and externally, for parcel transportation, and they are bound to come. If what I have said has aided in my mind that when the day of the domestic and foreign parcels post is reached the United States will become the natural purveyors to both the Orient and the Occident of those articles of commerce that minister to the needs of mortal man.

The Late Alfred C. Harmer.

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. SIBLEY,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, December 8, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. ALFRED C. HARMER, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Pennsylvania.

"Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a distinguished public servant, the House, at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings, shall stand adjourned.

"Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

"Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased."

Mr. SIBLEY said:

Mr. SPEAKER: It is indeed a privilege to join with my fellow-members in offering tributes to the memory of ALFRED C. HARMER. He was not alone an honor to our Commonwealth and our country, but an honor as well to the whole brotherhood of man.

In the Fifty-third Congress, through my close personal relations with the Hon. W. H. Hatch, of Missouri, I came to know and enjoy those traits of character which endeared Mr. HARMER to his associates. ALFRED C. HARMER and W. H. Hatch were conspicuous for their loyalty to party principles, the one a Republican and the other a Democrat, and yet between them there existed a friendship such as is too rarely found among men. They were as Jonathan and David in their union.

Never had I known two men in many points of resemblance so much alike, both giants physically and richly endowed mentally; but, beyond all else, endowed with large, warm hearts and clear moral perceptions. Personally they feared nothing in this world except to do a mean action. In battle fearless, bold, and rugged, always ready for the rough encounters of daily life, and yet to the last preserving those kindly instincts and human sympathies which were as easily awakened as those of the gentlest woman, producing such characters through the blending of loftiness and simplicity as we by common consent ascribe to those knights of old who graced the round table of King Arthur. Mr. Hatch, in the absence of Mr. HARMER, has talked to me for hours about his friend HARMER and his rare virtues, and, as a mutual friend of both, HARMER would tell me how the world was blessed by a man like Hatch.

Mr. Speaker, from this mundane sphere of activity both have passed to that higher sphere, to that truer, better life, where we may fondly trust the union between such friends is now complete and abiding. In these few words I join again these friends, for together I learned to know, respect, and love them. What new member of Congress that was not indebted to them for kindly words of counsel and for kindly acts performed? They lived not to themselves alone, but they lived for others; and many lives were brighter, many homes and hearts were blessed, because of the lofty purposes, the noble impulses of these two men.

ALFRED C. HARMER died the "Father of the House." W. H. Hatch died a private citizen, after conspicuous public service of many years. No eulogies upon Mr. Hatch have, consequently, been presented in this Chamber, but on this occasion I trust it is not amiss to thus refer to one of Mr. HARMER's friends and colleagues who first gave me to know the grand traits of character of ALFRED

C. HARMER, who, through an innate modesty and natural reserve, did not reveal altogether to the casual observer his strength, his nobility, and his real worth as a private citizen and a legislator.

The memory of ALFRED C. HARMER will forever be cherished by those who, like us, have had the opportunity to know his real value to his friends, his Commonwealth, and his country.

War-Revenue Reduction.

"Let us be true patriots and wise statesmen, fearing not to right a great wrong, but, boldly taking up our duty, give to the people a just and equitable revenue measure."

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. NORTON,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, December 15, 1900.

On the bill (H. R. 12394) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898, and to reduce taxation thereunder.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In the history of governmental transactions and legislation along the line of revenue production a stamp tax has always been regarded as an emergency measure, an unusual course to raise money for an extraordinary purpose, and it has always been argued whenever this unequal and unjust legislation has been proposed that as soon as the necessity passed by, the law would be repealed; but again and again history has repeated itself over and over and a long-suffering people have borne the burden of special taxation that a few might be benefited and prospered beyond measure.

This war-revenue tax is no exception to the long record of past experience. The framers and advocates of the measure expressly promised in unequivocal language that the act would be repealed at the close of the war. "If the war closes in six months, then in six months the bill will be repealed," were the words of its able champion, the lamented Mr. Dingley, and yet two years ago the war closed, and the war tax we still have with us; at least, we are told that there is no war; that it closed when the treaty of peace was signed and we paid out \$20,000,000 to Spain.

To-day our troubles in the Orient are simply neighborhood quarrels, and our brave boys are only acting as police squads, trying to preserve the peace, so of course there is no occasion for emergency taxation or the continuance of a war-revenue tax, and it should be repealed. But there is opposition. Why does it exist, and from whence does it originate? It is not always easy to delve deep in psychological springs of action, but sometimes, when the connection between cause and effect is so apparent, it does not seem difficult of solution. Mr. Chairman, I fully realize that the expenditures for war purposes were of great magnitude, and that incident to the war there is a continuing of indebtedness or continuance of need for great outlay to meet the enforced conditions consequent to the conduct of even a brief war; but, sir, a prudent business man adapts himself to the occasion and practices economy, and our nation should do the same. We have piled up an immense surplus. For the fiscal year of 1902 the Treasurer estimates a surplus of \$26,000,000, notwithstanding the enormous increase in national expenditures wholly due to imperialism.

At the extra session of Congress the Dingley tariff bill was enacted into a law. It was supposed to be the product of the financial and commercial genius of the nation's representative men, and as the result of the wisdom and business acumen of its creators we were told to build high our expectations of unexamined prosperity; that from the moment of its enforcement abundant revenues would flow into the coffers of the Government, mills would be opened by the thousands; that there would be no spot under the protecting fold of our flag where the hum of industry would not be heard; but this is all ancient history. You all know how bright and fair was the picture drawn, and how loud were the assurances given of the reality of their iridescent prophecies; and yet I need not to tell you what is written in your hearts and branded on your memory—how the Government failed to realize on the pledges made by those who had been nourished by its favor, fostered and protected by its care; how their promises were false, and proved to be the Dead Sea fruit of disappointment and failure. How reads the record?

Did the balance sheet of the Government, as made up by the Treasury officials, show that our "coffers were full," we had "riches untold?" Nay, not so! From the very first down through

every summing up, at the close of every month's business down to the present time, the Dingley tariff bill has been a deficit producer, and it is only by the mighty drain upon the resources of the people, through the far-reaching effect of the war-revenue bill, that we as a nation have been able to pay our bills. Do you say, then, that if this is the only source of sufficient revenue, why not continue it? We are supposed now to be on a peace basis, and our people are entitled to the enjoyment of all the blessings of peace, and our revenues and expenditures should now be so harmonized that this beneficent result could be attained. There is a vast field for legislation ready to be cultivated. The present tariff bill is the fertile parent of many a trust which fails to bear its fair and just share of taxation. I admit that if to-day the receipts from this war-revenue bill were cut off we could not pay our running expenses, but we can so legislate that even the mighty expenditures of the present can be met and the burden be more equally and justly divided.

Revise the tariff bill and pass an income tax and the Government will have a full treasury.

This bill is a step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough. The whole war-revenue bill should be repealed, but this Republican majority propose to manipulate it to suit the purposes of the few people who control and dictate the policy of the Administration.

In the matter of the beer tax this bill is unjust and discriminates against a legitimate industry. It is out of all proportion when considered with other commodities. If it were equal—if other industries of equal importance and extent were taxed to the same limit, while the tax would still be an onerous one, there would be no complaint; but this bill selects out this one industry, and because it has always met the demands made upon it for revenue in cases of emergency in the past, it now seeks to continue the double tax upon beer products.

We hear about rich brewers, with their fine residences and magnificent surroundings, as if out of all the business interests in the nation they were the only ones who had been fortunate. We hear no charge against them, though, of profiting by illegitimate schemes, but only that by close attention to business and watching expenses they have by frugality and care amassed a fortune. Let me ask, Are there not other rich classes? How about the Standard Oil people? How about the wire and steel magnates? How about all the multimillionaire members of the huge trusts that overshadow the land? Are none of these people wealthy, having fine homes and palatial country places? Why should not these be taxed as well as the brewers, or why should not the brewer be exempt if the steel king pays no special tax?

Then, in this connection, there is another glaring injustice in the existing law which should be, and justice demands must be, removed. In the placing of a five-dollar stamp upon every barrel of wine bottled there is a tax of 33½ per cent upon the valuation of the wine, and a blow is struck against the largest single industry in my district that is almost fatal. Our Government is based on liberty, equality, and justice. Why not be true in our legislative acts to the basic principles of our nation?

Let me read what the wine growers say upon this proposition:

HON. JAMES A. NORTON:

We, the undersigned wine growers, do strenuously protest against the continuance of the war tax or internal revenue on domestic bottled wine.

This is one of the most important products and industries of this country, although still in its struggling infancy and battling for life against the imported products and the prejudices in favor of the foreign products, and should be relieved of this burden as soon as possible and consistent with the demands and necessities of the National Government; and not only this, it needs all the fostering care and protection that our National Government can give to it, for with due nurture and protection this industry is destined to be second to none in importance to this country and the tide of importation changed to exportation, for we can, and do already, grow the finest grapes in the world, and there is no reason why we should not, to a great extent, supply the world with "the best wine in the world." A good, pure wine is the Creator's gift, while whisky and beer is the concoction of man.

We trust you will give this matter your prompt, persistent, and untiring attention and demand to the utmost of your ability and influence the removal of this burdensome tax.

The Sweet Valley Wine Co., per W. H. Reinhart, president; The Diamond Wine Co., per Pelz; The Engels & Krudwig Wine Co., Hugo F. Engels, secretary; A. Schmidt, Jr., & Bro.; The B. P. Sexton Co., C. L. Blatz, treasurer; A. Pentor, manager; Jno. G. Doon; The M. Hommel Wine Co., per M. Hommel, president; C. H. Strube Bottling Works; Edw. P. Moos; The Duroy & Haines Co., E. J. Haines, treasurer; E. L. Sleut; Aug. Guenther.

The truth of the matter is that the Republicans think to curry favor with a class of people who arrogate to their possession the entire morality of the nation by laying this burden upon the brewers and appealing to their patriotism to bear it. The express companies are equally able to bear as heavy a tax as the brewers, but they are left out. The intention of Congress, in passing the war-revenue bill at the outset, was that the express companies and the telegraph companies should pay the stamp tax, as the railroad companies do; but the wealthy people at the head of the express and telegraph companies, people who also live in fine houses, said no, they would not bear any share of the burden of government,

and from the outset have evaded the provisions of the stamp act by compelling their patrons to pay the tax.

Taxation should be so regulated as to rest equally upon all. To secure the protection of government, government must be maintained, and those who profit by the protection and care of government ought to aid in its maintenance. Accumulated wealth is under as great, aye, greater, obligation to do its proper share as is the laboring man who pays his tax from his meager earnings; but all taxation should be based upon justice and be uniform in its application. Further than this, taxation should not be oppressive, nor so heavy as to create a large surplus in the government treasury. I realize the trouble the Administration leaders are confronted with. All through the last campaign they cried "Prosperity is here," and promised the nation a continuance of prosperity if their party was successful; that President McKinley held the magic wand which alone could maintain "prosperity." Some of their party organs still keep up the cry, and even when the young speculator in Chicago forced the price of corn up to 50 cents a bushel last month the farmers of the West were told that "McKinley did it."

Here on the floor of this Chamber, however, the leaders are beginning to hedge, and the able member from New York [Mr. PAYNE] says: "We can not tell what may happen. We can not predict a uniform prosperity in this country during the next four years." And so they wish to continue this burdensome, vexatious war tax on through the years, so that when the inevitable business depression comes, and it is bound to come, this Administration may not be in the condition of the Cleveland Administration, which was confronted by a large and continuing deficit under the operation of the McKinley tariff. They state that this bill will cause a reduction in the revenues of \$40,000,000 a year. This is not enough.

From the receipts under the operation of this bill, if it passes Congress and becomes a law as it is, there will be a surplus on the 30th of June, 1902, of over \$146,000,000, exclusive and wholly independent of the Treasury redemption fund of \$150,000,000. Now, the people of this country need this money to use for themselves instead of having it piled up in the Treasury, the target for assault from all manner of syndicate schemers.

This tax was imposed for the purpose of carrying on a war with Spain. That war was long since over. Let us, then, now repeal the whole act, and not continue the grievous burden for the purpose of either carrying on war with China or with the Filipinos, neither to aid and abet syndicates and trusts to profit by their opportunity to plunder under existing laws. Let us be true patriots and wise statesmen, fearing not to right a great wrong, but, boldly taking up our duty, give to the people a just and equitable revenue measure.

Repeal of War-Revenue Taxation.

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN W. MADDUX,
OF GEORGIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 14, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 12394) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1898, and to reduce taxation thereunder—

Mr. MADDUX said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I desire to call the attention of the House to some remarks made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]. The newspapers report him this morning as saying that—

The Republican party while in power had never shown a deficit of the Treasury. When questioned about the old story that ex-Secretary of the Treasury Foster was preparing to issue bonds just before Cleveland's Administration came into power, General GROSVENOR said that the bonds were ordered prepared after consultation with Senator, afterwards Secretary, Carlisle. Subsequently Secretary Foster changed his mind, and the preparation was discontinued.

I also understood the gentleman from Ohio to say yesterday that when the newspapers had announced that Mr. Cleveland was elected for the second term, the receipts of the Treasury immediately began to fall off. I want to call the attention of the House to some figures from the Treasury Department, to show exactly what did happen.

The receipts of the Treasury in excess of expenditures for 1888 were \$111,341,273, in 1889 they were \$87,751,090, in 1890 they were \$85,040,271. During 1891, the year after the passage of the McKinley bill, the receipts in excess of the expenditures were \$26,838,541. In 1892 they were \$9,914,453, in 1893 they were \$2,341,674.

So now it will be observed from the reports of the Treasurer that this falling off of the Treasury receipts did not begin on the event of Mr. Cleveland's election.

During the year 1894, in which the McKinley bill was still in force, the expenditures exceeded the receipts \$68,803,260, although the expenditures were \$16,000,000 less than the year previous.

On the 1st day of March, 1889, the beginning of President Harrison's Administration, the funds in the Treasury actually available, exclusive of the \$100,000,000 gold reserve, were as follows: Agency accounts, \$64,502,445.02; net balance in Treasury, \$165,846,471.10—a total of \$230,348,916.12 in the Treasury when President Harrison began his Administration.

Mr. GAINES. That was net.

Mr. MADDOX. That was left by Mr. Cleveland.

On the 1st day of March, 1893, at the beginning of Mr. Cleveland's last term, the funds in the Treasury actually available, exclusive of the \$100,000,000 gold reserve, were as follows: Agency account, \$38,365,832.90; net balance in Treasury, \$24,084,742.28; making a total of \$62,450,575.18.

From the 1st day of March, 1885, the beginning of Mr. Cleveland's first term, to March 1, 1889, the public debt was reduced \$341,448,449.20; and from March 1, 1889, the beginning of Mr. Harrison's term, to March 1, 1893, the public debt was reduced \$236,527,666.10.

In addition to the ordinary receipts of the Government, there was covered into the Treasury during the Administration of President Harrison \$54,207,975.75, which was a fund held in trust for the redemption of national-bank notes.

From March 1, 1885, to March 1, 1889, the entire income of Mr. Cleveland's first term was \$1,451,666,346.74.

The amount received during Mr. Harrison's Administration, from March 1, 1889, to March 1, 1893, was \$1,539,723,590.58.

The amount expended during Mr. Cleveland's Administration, exclusive of bond purchases and the premiums thereon, was \$1,063,233,202.93.

Under Mr. Harrison's Administration, exclusive of bond purchases and the premiums paid thereon, the total expenditures were \$1,330,394,780.53.

The receipts under Mr. Harrison's Administration exceeded those under Mr. Cleveland \$88,063,343.84.

The expenditures of Mr. Harrison's Administration were greater than those of Mr. Cleveland's Administration by \$267,171,577.62.

Yet Mr. Cleveland retired nearly \$110,000,000 more of national debt than did Mr. Harrison, and still left an available surplus to Mr. Harrison of \$88,000,000 when he took charge of the Government.

Now, with regard to the receipts beginning to fall off immediately after the newspapers announced the election of Mr. Cleveland, I want to call to the attention of the House the testimony of Mr. Foster before the Ways and Means Committee.

Secretary FOSTER. Now, I want to say to you these estimates are based upon conditions existing prior to the late election [1892]. What effect the expectations of the public will have upon the revenues I do not undertake to estimate. For the first time, this month begins to show that effect. The revenues for the present month [February, 1893] will be about what they were last year [1892].

That evidence showed conclusively that the receipts in the month of February, 1893, were what they were, according to his testimony, in 1892. Now, these facts will show that the receipts in the Treasury began to fall off—that is, in comparison with the expenditures of this Government—down to \$2,000,000, or a little over \$2,000,000, available funds was in the Treasury when President Cleveland took charge of the Government. Or we may say that so far as the receipts were concerned there were \$30,000,000 excess in the Treasury, which consisted of subsidiary coin, and not available funds. We are told by gentlemen on the other side that it was the election of Mr. Cleveland that brought this condition of affairs about in this country, when the Treasury returns show for themselves upon their face that they declined from year to year.

Now, what else? On the 20th day of February, 1893, Mr. Foster ordered a print of bonds, as the record of his own order shows. On the 25th of that month he appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and advised them to raise the revenue at least \$50,000,000, when no Democratic Congress had convened, when President Cleveland had not been sworn in, and when for sixteen months thereafter had the revenues been affected by any Democratic legislation.

Mr. GAINES. If the gentleman will permit me, I want to state right in that connection that Mr. Secretary Foster ordered these bond plates on the 20th of February, and on the 25th, when he appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, he said nothing about ordering the bonds or the bond plates.

Mr. MADDOX. That is true: he said nothing about it. Still they were anticipating this deficit, and yet when Mr. Cleveland was inducted into office the Treasury was practically bankrupt and ready to go into the hands of a receiver. Still we are told that his administration produced a panic. So much for that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to this present bill I want to say for myself, speaking for myself alone, I do not see very well how this bill that the gentlemen present to us to-day could be bettered; that is, viewing it from your side of the House. I do not know that I would have changed it any if I had been in your position. The truth about it is, gentlemen, you are going to find it just as necessary to have a standing war fund in the Treasury, under your policy, as to have a standing army of a hundred thousand men. [Applause.]

Now, as the gentleman from New York said the other day, while he talked about European war and the effect that it might have upon this country, you will understand that when we started out in 1898 for the purpose of relieving those people down in Cuba, or the so-called purpose of relieving them from the cruel Spaniards, and began to intermeddle and to attend to other people's business, right then peace was at an end in this country; and I want to say now, for myself, that I am one of the few men on this side of the House, and possibly the only man—in fact I believe the only man—that protested against that war. I have heard it said upon this side that the Democrats took you by the slack of the breeches and nape of the neck and plunged you into that war. If there is any honor or credit attached to that, I claim none of it. I did not want to go into that war, but protested against it; and we would have been relieved of embarrassments and complications to-day if we had attended to our business and let other people's alone.

Sir, we have got to meet these issues as they are, as practical men, as sensible men, and we have got to keep funds enough to meet the demands of the country if we are to carry on this wholesale process of murder and slaughter in the Philippine Islands—[Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

War-Revenue Reduction.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JACOB RUPPERT, JR.,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, December 15, 1900.

On the bill (H. R. 13304) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898, and to reduce taxation thereunder.

Mr. RUPPERT said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The time has come when, in the judgment of the Ways and Means Committee of this House, it is feasible for us to reduce the extraordinary tax which was rendered necessary to defray the expenses of the war between this country and the Kingdom of Spain. It was not deemed advisable at the last session of Congress to make any changes in the internal-revenue law, but it is now admitted that a reduction can be made without jeopardizing the best interests of the country. In reducing taxation it is the part of wisdom and sound financial policy for us to examine into those taxes which are imposed and choose from them such as are most unequal and which impose the greatest burden, and any reduction should have for its object not only the lessening of revenues, but the equalization of burdens.

It is with some reluctance, Mr. Chairman, that I participate in the discussion upon the pending measure. Many statements of a misleading nature, however, have been made in this House about an industry with which I am familiar. In order that the House may have before it, in a proper manner, information and facts which I believe of importance in connection with the proposed reduction of the war-revenue tax on malted liquors, I desire to submit the following observations.

If the members of this House will carefully examine the provisions of the war-revenue law, they will find that the largest percentage of taxation levied for purely war purposes was placed upon beer.

The tax upon beer levied during the civil war, when that commodity was retailing at \$12 per barrel, was doubled under the war-revenue law, although the price of beer had decreased to \$5 per barrel.

At the time this tax was placed upon beer it was done for the reason that the tax on beer had been more promptly paid into the Treasury than any other tax, and it was believed that in an emergency a tax upon beer would raise a maximum amount of money with a minimum amount of time and expense in collecting. Had the brewers at that time raised a protest and fought this tax, as did other manufacturers in some other lines, it would probably never have been passed. But believing that the Government required

this money for a temporary purpose and that when the need was at an end the tax would cease, the brewers were willing that it should be imposed.

They assented to this tax with the understanding that when a reduction should be possible that reduction should be made for their benefit. While there was no compact or definite agreement to this end, it was nevertheless generally understood and assented to.

It would seem that an equitable obligation rested upon the Government of the United States to restore the former rate of tax upon beer. Beer is the most heavily taxed of any article subject to taxation. There is a peculiar reason why the rate of taxation upon beer should be lower than upon any other article. That reason rests in the fact that in addition to the value of the product of the breweries as a commodity, there is a system of laws in the several States which under the police power impose heavy taxes upon the brewing and allied interests. The constant tendency of these regulations is to increase the burdens upon the brewers. This necessitates a much larger capital than would be required if the business was not thus handicapped.

Congress has nothing to do with these State regulations, but the fact that they exist is one which must of necessity be considered in order to arrive at a just and equitable conclusion concerning the rate of internal-revenue taxes which should be placed upon beer.

It has for many years been the policy of this country to build up its manufacturing interests by means of protective laws. Congress has, in determining upon revenue laws, taken into consideration the needs of American manufacturers, and has as far as possible so fixed its schedules of taxation as to enable the manufacturers to successfully compete with foreign industries. The brewers have not asked for and have not obtained their share of this protective policy. Instead of free raw materials granted to most manufacturers, the raw materials used by the brewers have been heavily protected. Notwithstanding this fact, the American brewers have paid higher wages than are paid in foreign countries and have constantly improved the quality of their beer.

American brewers have taken a just pride in the reputation which their products have secured throughout the world. During the two past years the exports of beer have more than doubled. The exports for the ten months ending October, 1898, were \$711,540; for the ten months ending October, 1900, the exports amounted to \$1,845,421. It cost the American brewers more money to make their beer, but the increase in trade was caused by the superior quality of American goods. The exportation of American beer is in its infancy.

If the brewing industry were treated as other industries are treated, the United States would in a few years lead the world in this line of manufactures. There has never been a line of legislation placed upon the statute books with the object of benefiting or protecting this great and growing industry. The brewers are not asking that they be treated upon terms of equality with other manufacturers and be governed by the principles which are applied to all other industrial concerns. They appeal to Congress now not for any special privileges nor for equal opportunities, but they appeal for relief against a discrimination which will seriously cripple their business.

There is now invested in American breweries a little over \$700,000,000; of this amount, about \$50,000,000 is foreign capital. It has been necessary since the war tax was placed upon beer for the brewers to organize and assist each other in order to keep the industry from falling to pieces.

The production of beer shows a decrease during the first year of the tax and a slight increase during the last twelve months. It is necessary in order to maintain the reputation and the trade of American beers for the brewers to provide the market with as much beer as they have been in the habit of producing. If the trade which has cost the American breweries many millions of dollars to establish were to be neglected, or if the quality of American beer were allowed to deteriorate, it would take much time and vast expenditure of money to again secure the ascendancy. As a matter of self-protection, therefore, the large breweries have steadfastly declined to cheapen their beer or to greatly decrease their production. They have not considered it necessary, because they have felt satisfied that the first reduction of war taxes would be made upon beer. If they find that they are mistaken in this belief, they can no longer hold the smaller breweries, which have been losing money during the last two years, and a widespread bankruptcy must result. The large brewers will not go into bankruptcy, but they will be compelled to so regulate the production of beer and the price at which it is sold as to prevent actual loss.

The growth of the brewing industry will be effectually stopped. Thousands of men will be thrown out of employment, the retail price of beer must be raised, with the inevitable result that there will be a decrease in the consumption of beer and a corresponding increase in the consumption of spirituous liquors.

At the last four conventions held by the United States Brewers'

Association this question has received the most careful study by men who have spent their lives engaged in this business, and in their reports there is no attempt at eloquence or fine writing, but clear-headed, honest statements of fact from a conservative standpoint. I desire to quote from each of these four reports.

In the report of the convention held at Buffalo in 1897 the following statement was made:

Although repeatedly urged by the importers of raw materials used in brewing to join them in a remonstrance against the proposed increase in the rates of import duties, your trustees themselves refrained from and on various occasions unequivocally deprecated any opposition to tariff legislation. In this course they were guided by a twofold consideration. Knowing that the revenue deficiency absolutely required measures for raising additional income, they could not but conclude that, in accordance with the avowed policy of the dominant party, the increased revenues would necessarily have to be derived from import duties; and while they appreciated at its full weight the additional burden which higher duties upon barley, malt, hops, cork, tin foil, etc., would impose upon the trade, they could not consistently oppose such measures. It was believed possible at that time (the beginning of the present session) that a proposition would be made to increase the old war tax on malt liquors, and even if such an apprehension had been entertained it could but have strengthened our determination not to remonstrate against increased import duties.

With this determination firmly fixed in our minds and impressed and urged upon those local associations and members who sought our advice on the subject, we remained absolutely passive, allowing the importers to carry on their fight as might seem best to them.

At the beginning of the month of April the trade was startled by the news that the Senate Committee on Finance had determined upon raising the beer tax to \$1.44 per barrel, thus confirming rumors that had industriously been circulated during several weeks previous to this action, which rumors, it appears, had been carefully prepared and set in motion by a clique of manufacturers, who selfishly sought to influence legislation in their favor at any cost. It is a singular coincidence, to say the least, that the same gentlemen who first advocated an increase of the beer tax four years ago, published in the Forum an article again urging this increase at just about the time when these rumors began to assume a more definite shape. We refer, of course, to Mr. D. A. Wells. In the argument which we published against Mr. Wells's proposition four years ago we clearly demonstrated—

1. That Mr. Wells, when, as special revenue commissioner, he was in a position to judge of the matter from his own observation and experience, advocated the very opposite policy, citing innumerable evidences of the most convincing character to the effect that the tax on beer was as high as it could or should be, and that in order to make it a permanent and steadily increasing source of revenue the Government should let the brewing industry alone. This was thirty years ago, when the price of beer was twice as high as it is to-day and labor very much cheaper.

2. That Mr. Wells's recantation of his former view involved him in a dilemma from which there was no escape except by formulating and advocating a fiscal policy which ought to bring a blush to the face of every civilized man. Although there are thousands of products from which the Government derives no income whatever, Mr. Wells holds that, inasmuch as the brewer already pays and himself collects for the Government a tax of \$1 per barrel, the easiest way of raising additional revenue would be to increase that tax, the easy collectibility of any tax being in his opinion the only and paramount consideration that should guide the lawmakers' course.

We do not think it necessary to enter into a detailed discussion of this question, but for the sake of completing our record, we produce here a summary of the reasons we urged against the proposed increase, viz:

1. Because it is unjust to saddle additional burdens upon an industry that has uninterruptedly and uncomplainingly borne the old war tax ever since its first imposition (aiding the Government in devising and maintaining means for its prompt collection), while all the other internal war taxes have been totally abolished, except as to ardent spirits and tobacco, in which latter instances the rates of 1865 have been considerably reduced.

2. Because when the war tax of \$1 was imposed beer sold at \$12 per barrel while to-day, the tax remaining the same, less than one-half of the amount is the average price, wages and the ordinary operating expenses of breweries and the capital required in the business having vastly increased in the meantime.

3. Because when this tax was first imposed the burdens borne by the traffic in the shape of local taxes or license fees did not exceed in any State the sum of \$300, while at the present time in some States these local taxes range up to \$2,000 for each saloon, the total sum of such local taxes and license fees throughout the country amounting to probably \$60,000,000, a disproportionately large share of which enormous sum must be and is borne by beer, as may be seen from a single example in point, to wit, the State of New York, where, out of a total of over \$11,000,000 derived from the traffic, the beer interests paid about \$7,000,000. In the present condition of the market the brewer would be compelled to raise the price of his product, and the dealer, on his part, in order to make up the difference, would have to reduce the size of his measures.

4. Because neither from an economic nor from an ethical point of view does it appear justifiable to increase the war tax on beer while native wines are totally exempt from taxation.

5. Because as a revenue measure the increase is based on erroneous premises, for while it is true that under the present system, which imparted to the industry an exceedingly valuable element of stability, the production has steadily increased, it is more than probable that the increased tax will produce a decline in the business.

6. Because the increase would be a most potent incentive to the formation of trusts, and would most assuredly drive out of the business a large proportion of the smaller brewers. The significance of this will be appreciated if you state the undeniable fact that one-half of the beer produced in this country is manufactured by about 100 large brewers, while the other half is made in about 1,000 smaller establishments.

7. Because, although a tax may at first be borne by the brewers, to be used as a means of competition by the stronger trade rivals, it will in the end have to be paid by the consumer in one way or another, and this we deem not only unjust but extremely unwise from a temperance point of view, for beer, whatever fanatics may say to the contrary, has become and is to-day one of the necessities of life to a large part of our people, and as such has a strong tendency to enhance the well-being of the consumers and to modify drinking habits in the direction of true temperance.

8. Because the increase is calculated to place a double burden upon the consumer, inasmuch as it is imposed in order to offset a loss of revenue which would inevitably be caused by the proposed prohibitive duties on other articles of daily consumption, the price of which would thus necessarily be enhanced, to the great disadvantage of the consumer and for the benefit of certain domestic industries.

9. Because, instead of creating a "minimum of industrial disturbance"—a consideration which is urged by one of the foremost advocates of the in-

crease as a paramount requirement of any change in the tax system—the increase will most assuredly unsettle and injuriously affect the brewing industry.

The reasons thus clearly and succinctly set forth by the brewers' association, given in opposition to the placing of the extra one-dollar tax upon beer, are even stronger when used to favor a proposition to remove the tax from beer. There is not a single statement made by the brewers' association in the memorial from which I have quoted that actual experience has not carried out. The history of the beer trade during the past three years has shown that the men who examined into that question before the imposition of the one-dollar tax were absolutely correct in each conclusion which they reached. Within the past few months a large number of small brewers have been driven into bankruptcy. Some of the large brewers have conducted business at a loss, others have barely paid expenses, and none have made a fair interest upon the capital invested. The losses to those who hold stock in the brewing association have been far greater than the amount realized by the Government from the tax. If dividends are paid at all they are very much smaller than they formerly were, and few of the companies have paid any dividends.

This matter has been discussed in each annual meeting of the United States Brewers' Association, and among all of the members of that organization not one could be found who could hazard any suggestion that would point to a feasible way of restoring the brewing business to its former prosperous condition except the single method of securing the abolition of the extra one-dollar tax placed upon beer by the war-revenue law.

These facts have been urged at each session of Congress, but heretofore it has not been deemed advisable to reduce the receipts of Government under the war-revenue tax. It is now conceded that these receipts should be reduced, and the only industry which is able to show any great detriment to its interests by reason of the war tax is the brewing industry. In all fairness and justice the petition of these gentlemen ought to be granted. Their reasons for such a petition were so strongly presented in a letter to the Ways and Means Committee written last month that I incorporate that letter with my remarks:

To the honorable Committee on Ways and Means
of the House of Representatives.

GENTLEMEN: At the kind invitation of your chairman we have had the honor, on the 25th day of April, 1900, to appear before your honorable body for the purpose of submitting to your kind consideration several statements showing the deplorable condition of the brewing industry, caused by the war tax of \$1 per barrel superimposed upon the old war tax of an equal amount, and praying for the immediate repeal of that part of the war-revenue act.

The statements then submitted by our representatives form part of the records of your honorable committee, and we therefore refrain from a detailed recital of the facts therein set forth. We desire, however, to state that since then the destructive effects of the double war tax have been augmented and aggravated to such an extent that a very large proportion of the smaller establishments have been forced into bankruptcy and out of business, or compelled to seek escape from utter ruin by combining with other breweries, equally hampered and harassed by a tax representing 40 per cent of the market price of their product and entailing losses which, for reasons explained in our previous statements, they can not recoup in the ordinary way in which any tax upon consumption is usually recovered.

Since April, 1900, no less than fifteen combinations of from three to twelve once prosperous establishments have been formed under the distressing pressure of the double war tax, and this baneful tendency toward the destruction or the absorption of the smaller manufactories and the combination of large numbers of establishments whose profits have been either wiped out or reduced to an infinitesimal minimum is not confined to the smaller cities, but embraces such large brewing centers as Boston, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, and others. But even these combinations offer no appreciable relief; they are mere makeshifts of a transitory character. The best proof of this lies in the fact that of the companies whose stocks are quoted in the trade papers scarcely 20 per cent can pay any interest even on their preferred stock.

If you would kindly consider what an immense cash capital it requires to place the finished product into the market, exclusive of the vast sums of money expended in the purchase of material, the payment of workmen, and the storage and distribution of malt liquors—not to speak of the interest on the capital permanently invested—you will readily perceive why the smaller brewer, whose establishment represents the savings of a lifetime, and who has no accumulated available capital to draw upon, must necessarily succumb in an industrial struggle which the imposition of a double war tax has rendered almost hopeless even to those manufacturers who possess a considerable reserve of cash capital.

This is only one side of the question; but it is the one which shows the pernicious effects of a most unjust tax in the most glaring light and appeals to other sentiments besides that of justice in the abstract. In our opinion it should not, however, require such appeals in order to bring about the immediate repeal of the entire war tax, superimposed upon the old war tax. There was no equitable justification for it at the time of its imposition, because the brewing industry had up to the time uninterruptedly paid the old war tax of \$1 per barrel, while all other manufactures, products, professions, and occupations embraced in the original revenue system as organized between the years 1862 and 1864 have not paid a single dollar into the Federal Treasury since the termination of the civil war, and do not even now contribute one penny toward the Federal revenue.

Is it unfair or unpatriotic to ask why one American industry, consuming almost exclusively those highly protected American products which are a source of wealth to the American farmer, should pay a double war tax amounting to 40 per cent of the market value of its product while all other American industries remain untaxed? It will not be deemed to be presumptuous, we trust, if we ask what justification there was for imposing, or what good reason there is for continuing, a tax of \$2 upon a barrel of beer costing \$5, in the face of the fact that at a time (thirty-five years ago) when the market price of beer was \$12 a Republican Administration and a Republican Congress asserted and maintained that a standard of \$1 "was fully up to the revenue standard and should not be increased." (See Report of the Special Revenue Commission for 1885-86, p. 27.)

We maintain, gentlemen, that common justice imperatively demands the immediate repeal of the additional war tax upon malt liquors. In the entire war-revenue act of 1898 there is not a single tax item excepting our own that is unjust or inequitable in itself; none, excepting the beer tax, that has caused or is likely to cause widespread industrial ruin; none, again with the same exception, that must be borne by a comparatively small number of citizens for the exclusive benefit of all those numerous and immensely wealthy industries which, while protected by wise tariff laws, contribute not a single dollar to the internal revenue; and, finally, none that must ultimately affect such large masses of the poorer people.

Even if the market price of beer were higher than it was thirty-five years ago, instead of being not even half as high, we would still maintain that so long as all other manufactures, professions, and occupations remained untaxed the imposition of a war tax of \$1 in addition to the old war tax of an equal amount can not be justified, though it may be excused, perhaps, on the ground of the sudden and pressing emergencies of an unlooked-for complication threatening the honor of the nation.

The most striking evidence of the correctness of our contention as to the inequality and injustice of the present tax rate lies in the fact that in 1896, when the receipts from internal revenue reached the highest point, viz., \$310,906,984, the three revenue items which have remained in force (at reduced rates as to the spirits) since the civil war only yielded \$50,129,877, of which the sum of \$5,115,140 was derived from malt liquors, then selling at \$12 per barrel. The remainder, amounting to \$250,777,107, came from sources of revenue the greater portion of which are not mentioned in the act which imposed upon our product an additional war tax of \$1.

Mr. Chairman, I think that injustice has unwittingly been done the brewers by reason of the fact that the beer business is very little understood by those not engaged in it, and the brewers, feeling that it was the part of true patriotism not to fight very strenuously against war taxes, have not been loud or persistent in their demands upon the Ways and Means Committee. It is a fact, borne out by the official records, that the beer tax has been the most cheerfully paid and the least evaded of any tax provided for in the war-revenue law. I think it is true that this has influenced the opinion of some of the members that it was therefore a tax which was not burdensome. This is far from being the case. It is the most burdensome of any of the war taxes. It is the highest of the war taxes and upon a business which is not able to stand it by reason of the sharp competition from other countries. It is certainly not the intention of Congress to reward those who have sought to evade their just share of the responsibilities of government and punish those who have borne their burdens cheerfully and without complaint.

I want the members of this House, before they vote upon this question, to read carefully the reports of the Brewers' Association and the memorials now on file. They will find them candid, fair, and impartial. They will find neither demands nor threats. They will find no theories or vagaries. They will find only plain, straightforward statements of fact, and from those statements any reasonable man must conclude that this extra tax is beyond the revenue point and constitutes an actual confiscation of the profits of those engaged in the brewing business. They will see that, with the facts as they exist, this great industry is seriously crippled and that its growth in the future will be an impossibility under the present rate of taxation. This is not a party question, nor is it a theoretical question. We do not seek to reach the prejudices of any man. We want the subject considered as a plain, common-sense business proposition, and when it is thus considered we have no fear of the result. Those engaged in the brewing business are proud of the record achieved in the past, and they hope to surpass that record in the future. They can realize that hope if their business is treated upon the same terms as other occupations. Their business must decline if it is to be singled out as a revenue producer beyond its ability and unjust and unequal burdens placed upon it.

Reapportionment.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN F. RIXEY,

OF VIRGINIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, January 5, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 12740) making an apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Twelfth Census.

Mr. RIXEY said:

Mr. SPEAKER: While Madison and Hamilton, authors of the Federalist, can not be said to have had any idea that this country would stretch to Mexico and the Pacific, it may be of some interest to know what they said as to the number of Representatives.

In No. 55 of the Federalist, urging the adoption of the Constitution, it is stated:

In general, it may be remarked on this subject that no political problem is less susceptible of a precise solution than that which relates to the number most convenient for a representative legislature. * * * The number of which this branch of the Legislature (House of Representatives) is to consist

at the outset of the Government will be 65. Within three years a census is to be taken, when the number may be augmented to 1 for every 30,000 inhabitants; and within every successive period of ten years the census is to be renewed, and augmentations may continue to be made under the above limitation.

It will not be thought an extravagant conjecture that the First Census will, at the rate of 1 for every 30,000, raise the number of Representatives to at least 100. * * * At the expiration of twenty-five years, according to the computed rate of increase, the number of Representatives will amount to 200, and of fifty years to 400. This is a number which, I presume, will put an end to all fears arising from the smallness of the body. I take for granted here what I shall, in answering the fourth objection, hereafter show—that the number of Representatives will be augmented from time to time in the manner provided by the Constitution. On a contrary supposition, I should admit the objection [to the smallness of the number of Representatives] to have very great weight indeed.

Evidently it was expected that the country would not only grow, but that the number of Representatives would be increased to keep pace to some extent with the population.

There are three plans presented:

The Hopkins bill, providing for 357 members.

The Burleigh bill, providing for 386 members.

The Crumpacker bill, providing for 365 members.

Which shall we adopt, and under what ratio shall the Representatives be elected for the next ten years?

It was the theory of the founders of the Republic that the Senate should stand as the representative of the States, and the House, a larger body, as the representative of the people. The ratio up to 1860 never exceeded one for every hundred thousand, the table in full being as follows:

	Ratio.	Whole number of Representatives.
Constitution, 1789	30,000	65
First Census, 1793	33,000	105
Second Census, 1803	33,000	141
Third Census, 1813	35,000	181
Fourth Census, 1823	40,000	213
Fifth Census, 1833	47,700	240
Sixth Census, 1843	70,680	223
Seventh Census, 1853	93,423	233
Eighth Census, 1863	127,381	243
Ninth Census, 1873	131,425	293
Tenth Census, 1883	151,911	325
Eleventh Census, 1893	173,901	356

After every census the membership of the House has increased, except in one instance, and never in such cases less than 10. In the eleven apportionments following the new censuses there are only four instances in which the increase was less than 31. The present ratio of 173,901 is greater than it has ever been in the history of the Government. The Hopkins bill raises this to 208,868, whereas the Burleigh bill raises it to 194,182. Which is most equitable to all concerned?

In but three instances in the one hundred and eleven years of our enumerations did the increase in the ratio exceed 20,000. As late as 1870 it was only 4,044. The increase under the Hopkins bill is 34,967, which is greater than in any former reapportionment. The increase under the Burleigh bill is 20,381, which is far more than the average increase, as there are but three instances out of the eleven in which a greater increase was made.

The Burleigh bill, upon precedent, is nearer right, and in practice works no injustice to any. The Hopkins bill does injustice not only to Maine, Nebraska, and Virginia, but to others, as shown by the minority report. With but a single exception there is no precedent for the Hopkins bill, to have no increase in membership after a census showing a large increase in population. Under a popular form of government increase in representation should go with increase in population.

The Hopkins bill is based upon the idea of limiting the number of Representatives to the present number. The reason assigned being, first, economy; second, dispatch of business, and third, lack of accommodation in the House. Should a Congress which appropriates over a hundred million dollars annually for the Army and one hundred and forty-five millions for pensions, with a total of seven hundred millions for expenses, hesitate to provide for 29 additional Representatives at a yearly cost of \$200,000?

To the objection that the House would become unwieldy by the addition of 29 Representatives, the reply is that under the rules now prevailing numbers constitute no impediment to business. It is well known that under the rules of the House all the business of a long session could, if necessary, be railroaded through in one month. The House has to wait for the smaller body, the Senate, and not the Senate for the House.

But if the reason alleged were sound, it would be effective also against the present number, 357. In England the House of Commons, with a much smaller constituency, consists of 670 members, and in France the House of Deputies, also with a much smaller constituency, consists of 684 members. In Germany the popular branch consists of 357 members.

But it is seriously urged, as a final reason, that the House can

not well accommodate more than 357 Representatives. This is not true, however. With the present arrangement, which is awkward enough, there is ample room, according to the Architect of the Capitol, for the reasonable addition provided for under the Burleigh bill. Such a reason, however, is unworthy of a great government which can bear the expenditures of \$1,500,000,000 by one Congress. Such a government can well afford a shelter for the Representatives of the people. On this point the Philadelphia Inquirer of December 20, 1900, aptly says:

THE PROBLEM OF REAPPORTIONMENT.

We were not mistaken in supposing that the plan of reapportionment which by the majority of a single vote was favorably reported by the House Committee on Census would encounter a vigorous opposition. This plan fixes the ratio of representation at 208,868, the reason for the adoption of this figure being that an enlargement of the membership of the House would thus be avoided. There are reasons why that is desirable, but there are no reasons why it should be regarded as so desirable as to render it an absolutely controlling consideration.

It is said that the Hall of the House of Representatives is so small that it is already uncomfortably crowded, and that it would be difficult to make room for any more members. But surely it will not be seriously maintained that the number of Representatives whom the American people shall send to the popular branch of Congress shall be determined by the seating capacity of the room in which they assemble. To state that proposition is to refute it, for its ridiculous character becomes at once apparent. A more weighty argument is made by those who contend that the capacity of a legislative body for the dispatch of business decreases in proportion to its numerical magnitude.

So it does, and a body half the size of the present House would be more efficient. But some sacrifice must be made to the principle of popular representation, and there is no reason to suppose that a moderate increase in the membership of the House would appreciably interfere with the discharge of its duties. What is a moderate increase? The second of the plans most generally discussed places the ratio at 197,787. With this figure as a basis the membership of the House would be raised to 377. That increase is less than moderate—it is small; yet it would do very well but for the fact that its adoption would deprive each of a member the four States of Kansas, Maine, Nebraska, and Virginia.

Now, it will be admitted that it is not desirable that the membership of any State should be reduced, and it is less desirable as regards those named, because, as their delegation is already small, any reduction means a great proportional loss. Thus, Maine only elects 4 members. She loses a fourth of her representation if she is to be allowed only 3. The third plan under discussion places the ratio at 182,676, which would elect a House of 387 members. Is this increase, an increase of 30, anything more than moderate? We don't think so. It would leave the House of Representatives a much smaller body than any other legislature of corresponding importance. There are over 600 members in the British House of Commons, and nearly as many in the French Chamber of Deputies, and no one has yet proposed the reduction of either body.

But let us not entirely ignore the Crumpacker bill. Our silence might be construed as contempt for the measure. It gives no ratio, and does not propose to base representation upon population. It is unfair in character and intolerant in sectionalism. It is intended to minimize the influence and punish the South for providing for good local government. The author of this bill very lightly disposes of restrictions in other States than the South, and does not seek, for that reason, to cut down the representation of any State north of Mason and Dixon's line. He says, page 123 of report:

Other States than those mentioned have restrictive qualifications upon manhood suffrage, but they are of such a character and apply to such conditions that it can not be said that in any particular State they directly and necessarily disfranchise a sufficient number of citizens to materially affect the basis of representation. In a number of States it is doubtless true that there is a large suppression of the vote, but it results from the maladministration of the law rather than from its requirements.

Under the Crumpacker bill Virginia would lose none, but Louisiana would lose 2, North Carolina 4, South Carolina 3, and Mississippi 3.

The cause of our Southern States is the cause of Virginia. Their people are our people. Where they go we will go. Their bed shall be ours. Virginia will stand firm to resist, at a loss to her own prestige, every such indignity offered a sister Southern State, and no political or other advantage shall swerve her from her devotion to her kith and kin.

It seems to me there can be but one explanation for this bill. Its author must expect to be a candidate for the nomination of the Republican party for President, and this bill must be intended as a bid for the Southern delegates to the Republican national convention, but I would remind the gentleman that history and experience both show that he is bidding too long in advance. See these gentlemen later, would be my advice.

Under the Hopkins bill the following States (8 in number) would lose a Representative: Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Nebraska, Ohio, South Carolina, Virginia. Not because they have not increased in population, for they have—only one State, Nevada, showing a decrease, and that State is not affected, having only one Representative.

Virginia has increased in population nearly 200,000, or about 11 per cent, in ten years. A good, healthy growth, but not enough, under the Hopkins bill raising the ratio to 208,868, to hold her present representation.

I can now sympathize with those cities, which, not realizing the population their imagination had conceived, have cried fraud or incompetency in the count. I have listened to such claims with much incredulity, but I am now convinced that there may be

some truth in their wailings. Virginia's increase, while healthy, is much more than is given.

The Eighth district, which I have the honor to represent, lies just across the Potomac, and fronts for a hundred miles on that historic stream. That district, under the census, shows but a small increase. Anyone familiar with the conditions must be convinced of the incorrectness of the census. Within the past ten years hundreds, I will say thousands, of people have moved into and settled near the lines of the railroads which permeate the district. Hundreds of officeholders live there but claim residence in other States. What, then, is the reason for the small increase reported?

I reply by asking another question.

How can a just enumeration be expected when some of the best enumerators are not paid as much as \$50? One enumerator, whose district was in a fine agricultural section, wrote me:

My district was about 12 miles one way and 15 the other. I took down 1,640 living persons, 180 farms, 21 manufacturing establishments, 26 deaths, and 3 deaf and dumb. Time actually employed, thirty-six days two hours. I received from the Government \$79.25, which was about what my horse and board would have cost me.

Another, whose district was in a good-sized town, wrote me, under date of June 15:

Having understood through Mr. Grimm, whose son was appointed enumerator for this district, that the supervisor, Mr. Campbell, and yourself had called upon the Director of the Census and had the per capita raised to 2½ cents, I desire to state that, so far as I know, I am the only one in the county who was compelled to sign a contract at 2 cents per capita. The niggardly compensation, at best, is contemptible in consideration of the duties performed, being compelled to expose myself to all kinds of low and dirty diseases to obtain the desired information.

I answered this letter, and under date of July 3 he again wrote me:

In reply I would state that I have made two hundred and seven hours and thirty-five minutes. The compensation will be, according to agreement, \$44.21. As I understand the law governing the pay, it was not to be less than \$3 per day, or 3 cents per head.

I forwarded this letter to the Director, who replied that—

After a careful examination of the returns I find that Mr. ——— averaged \$1.43 per day, and made a total of \$39.78. The law required me to establish the rates of compensation at least two weeks prior to the enumeration, so that you will realize that I can not at the present time make any change in the rates of compensation established for the enumerators, even though I desired to do so.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that in the county in which this enumerator served, at a total compensation of \$39.78, and where the other enumerators were doubtless as poorly paid, a county which in fertility has no superior in Virginia and in attractiveness none in the United States, should show a decrease of 1,326 since the census of 1890?

Can a fair enumeration be expected under such circumstances? Before the enumerators began their work I requested a per diem compensation for them, but could not get it. In sparsely settled sections the enumerators could scarcely be expected to discharge their duty for the small compensation allowed. They should have been paid not less than \$100 in every instance, and I would like the Committee on Census to report such a bill.

If the committee does not want to increase the membership, why not take the ratio for 350 members? The additions would soon bring the membership to the present number, 357. If the ratio for 350 is taken the following States would lose 1: Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Nebraska, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia.

The reason is apparent. The States interested could easily defeat such a proposition. Virginia would lose but 1, but there would be 11 other States in the same category. Why take a ratio which gives but 7 more members, but takes out of this list the States of Georgia, Iowa, Michigan, and Tennessee? Is it to gain votes? It is unjust discrimination under the disguise of limiting the membership of the House to the present number.

The Burleigh bill is fairer. It injures none and credits all with their reasonable due. I am glad of an opportunity to support a bill which will give to North Carolina an additional Representative, making her equal to Virginia. Her wonderful development in population, and her great material development—manufacturing in cotton alone more than she produces of the raw material—entitles her to this testimonial to her progress and development. She has earned it, and I will not be the one to withhold it from her. An additional Representative should be hers. May her star never shine less brightly. And Missouri, whose sons upon this floor so proudly acclaim her "Imperial"—the Empire State of the West, whose past is but a favorable augury of her future greatness—shall we not concede to this great giant of the middle West the additional Representative as provided in the Burleigh bill? We are equally gratified at the additions to the representation in other States. Increasing largely in population, they are entitled to additional representation. Let us pass the Burleigh bill. It cuts down the representation of none, and accords justice to all.

Reapportionment Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. ADOLPH MEYER,
OF LOUISIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 9, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 12740) making an apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Twelfth Census.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not propose to discuss at length the question whether the membership of this House shall be so increased as to avoid the reduction of representation accorded to States which have fallen behind others in the growth of population. It seems to me, however, that this policy of so enlarging this body is open to grave objection. That some States should increase more rapidly than others is inevitable. It will always be so. If, therefore, the rule to be adopted be that no State shall ever suffer a reduction of its representation even for a decade the result will be that this House will go on increasing every ten years until ere very long it will become as large as the French Assembly or the British House of Commons. Such a body could not be properly accommodated in this Hall if all the members should have seats and the desks be retained.

Already it is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for members sitting on the rear rows in this Hall to keep in touch with the business of the House and to know what is going on. This is a very great evil already, and it would be magnified by every increase of the aggregate membership of the House. In precisely the same proportion you would diminish the study and observation of the proceedings of the House, which is the primary essential of intelligent and responsible membership. Absenteeism is already a great evil. It would be increased rapidly when members found themselves unable to watch the proceedings of the House.

Members even more than now would depend upon their fellow-members for getting the cue how to vote, and the number of independent, self-reliant, and conscientious members would be seriously diminished. If there was a full attendance of members the House would be, in all probability, more turbulent and disorderly than we have ever seen it. It would be more difficult for the presiding officer to maintain order. There would be more of personalities, interruptions, applause, hisses, and all forms of disorder which discredit legislative bodies and impair their efficiency, popularity, and usefulness. These are not mere prophecies, resting on what we know of the tendencies of the human mind in certain conditions.

We have object lessons before us already in the disorders and violence of the French Assembly. The House of Commons has frequently had a similar experience. Its only escape from these admitted evils has been the increase of the Speaker's power till it has become almost autocratic. I ask you, What value is possessed in the State's right of representation if the power of the Speaker is to be increased until all the rights of the individual member are gone? Have we not already traveled as far in this direction as it is prudent or safe to go?

One of the consequences of a very large House of Representatives will be the virtual abolition of the ye-a-and-nay vote. In the British House of Commons the settlement of all public questions is by tellers or a division. The votes of members are counted, not officially recorded. I think our own present system preferable by far. It tends to greater responsibility. I think all candid observers of our parliamentary system will concede that the power of committees, both in the House of Representatives and the Senate, is as great as it ought to be. Many persons believe that it is already much too great. In the French Assembly, I believe, they have very large committees, and much of the public business is settled there. Surely it is not desirable to increase the numbers of our committees to twenty-five or thirty members, and still less is it expedient to augment the power of these committees. Yet if we are to go on every ten years increasing the membership of the House these consequences must be the result.

Our rules are already very artificial, and in order to understand them they require a special study. Some of the gentlemen who have been most eminent members of this House in the past have candidly admitted that they knew nothing about the rules of the House. Is it not probable that if the House becomes a much larger body the rules will become even more arbitrary in order to expedite the public business? Some think that this is no evil. But would not this change tend to lessen the individual responsibility of members; to substitute the rule of the caucus for the wise, thoughtful action of the House?

I think, sir, that we ought to consider very seriously the danger, lest by making this House a large, cumbersome, and unwieldy body we diminish its relative rank in the Government, and, what is of more consequence, its value to the people. It ought to be, and was probably intended by the fathers of the Republic to be, the most important guardian in our whole system of the individual rights, liberties, and property of the people. Its members are directly chosen by the people. If there is anything wrong in any Congressional district, the people can easily correct it. The Representative lives among them, according to our custom. We must meet them face to face. If he be an incompetent or faithless public servant, they can turn him out in two years.

In the early period of the Republic the greatest men of the country sought a membership in this body. I need not remind you how Madison, Randolph, Clay, Jackson, Webster, Calhoun, Hunter, Silas Wright, Fisher Ames, Edward Livingston, James A. Bayard, Josiah Quincy, John Quincy Adams, Langdon Cheves, and many more great minds in later times were among its members. At that time and down to a recent period the House of Representatives had at least equal influence and consideration with the Senate. Now all this is changed. The Senate is commonly regarded as a sort of promotion. It is spoken of as the "Upper House."

How this change has come about it might be difficult to explain, but one cause will partly account for it. The Senate has a simple set of rules. It is limited in numbers, not crowded. It is pre-eminently a deliberative body, perhaps the grandest in the world. The House has gone on increasing in numbers, but losing in the capacity to examine, discuss, and shape public measures. The fault is not in the personnel of the members. It has a number of very strong men. It is in the system. Beyond all doubt there is a point where the great representative feature and merit of our system is impaired by weight of numbers. There are features in the decaying power, reputation, and influence of this great body upon which it would be almost painful to dwell. The remedy is not to be found in an increase of membership. The admitted evils of the system have gone on increasing with the growth of the body.

For these, and other considerations, I shall feel it my duty to support the bill reported by the majority of the committee as the wisest solution of the important question of representation. I favor it as an alternative to a dangerous and unsafe proposition, and as a step toward a policy which shall tend to place this body upon the highest possible plane of statesmanship and influence.

In what I have said I am free from the imputation that my State gains or loses in her number of Representatives by the adoption of one proposition or the other. I am glad to say that she will gain a member both under the committee bill and under the proposed substitute, or Burleigh bill.

PROPOSED REDUCTION OF SOUTHERN REPRESENTATION.

Mr. Speaker, I now desire to refer especially to the proposition made to reduce the representation of certain Southern States upon the pretext or ground that these States have limited the suffrage by imposing some new qualifications. A demand has lately been made to this effect in a number of public journals belonging to the Republican party, and the suggestion has been repeated by various gentlemen prominent and influential in public affairs. In the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress a bill was introduced by a distinguished Representative from the State of Indiana requiring the Director of the Census to furnish Congress with statistical information to be used in the apportionment of Representatives, and it was then understood that this information, when obtained, was to serve as a basis for the proposed reduction.

This bill did not pass Congress and, as I understand, no such information or statistics as those contemplated in this bill has been embraced in the last census. Notwithstanding this, fact the same eminent Representative has undertaken to offer a bill at this session, which, in the absence of any official information or statistics, arbitrarily reduces the representation of my own State of Louisiana from six to four members, Mississippi from seven to four members, North Carolina from nine to four members, and South Carolina from seven to four members. These reductions are purely arbitrary and no reason for them is assigned in the bill. The reductions made are much in excess of the reduction of qualified electors in Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina. In North Carolina the new constitutional amendment does not go into operation until the year 1902; but without waiting for any statistics or for the new suffrage provisions to take effect, more than one-half of the present representation of North Carolina is summarily abolished.

This bill proceeds upon lines and principles that it is hardly possible can be passed into law: but there is enough of misconception existing on this subject in the Northern States to make it appropriate for some one to state the actual situation in the South and to develop the actual facts, at least in part. When these facts are known and studied, I can not but hope that candid men will regard the steps taken by the States I refer to as not only in con-

formity with the Federal Constitution, but as a wise and necessary policy to secure the best interests of all classes of our people. I profoundly deprecate any attempt to curtail the representation of the Southern States as uncalled for, harsh, savoring of persecution, and, above all, as tending to revive the sectional bitterness and estrangement which it is the highest duty of patriotism to extinguish as speedily as possible.

I shall hail the day when nothing of this feeling shall remain in the land. For one I ask no privilege for Louisiana, either on this question or any other, that I would not gladly accord to every other State in the Union, both North and South, and I can conscientiously affirm that in all my votes and public course on this floor I have tried to serve every portion of the common country. I shall continue to do so. I have no duty to my own State or section that would lead me to assail any other locality of the Union, and if there be a legitimate public interest or object elsewhere I shall seek to promote it. I am sorry to note the existence of any other spirit or purpose among those who are charged with the great trust of legislation, and I hope it may soon pass away.

The recent centennial celebration of the removal of the national capital to this city and the eloquent addresses delivered on that occasion have impressed on every American citizen in a vivid manner the wonderful advance of the country in population, the industrial arts, manufactures, commerce, and wealth. It is indeed a great record of material progress. Much of this history is a proud one, and yet the period embracing the past forty or fifty years contains in its history some pages which many of us would willingly efface.

The fact that for the union of hearts and hands which bore our fathers through the trials and struggles of the Revolution, held the States together in the hard days of poverty and depression that followed, and made possible that noblest product of the human mind—our Federal Constitution, with its early and almost contemporaneous amendments—there should have been substituted in later years sectional bitterness, distrust, and hatred, followed by a desolating war for four years, with all its frightful losses and suffering and the final conquest of fifteen States, including six of the thirteen States that formed the original Confederacy, ought to be inexpressibly painful to every true American.

I do not propose now to discuss the merits of that dreadful conflict or to impute blame to either side; but I will say this much, that if the Northern States had been content with the attainment of the objects of the war with which they set out, they would have found the Southern whites not only ready to acquiesce in all those demands, but to acquiesce also in the abolition of negro slavery, notwithstanding the enormous property loss and dislocation of social order involved in this policy to them and them only; but the South would also have been ready to cooperate frankly and fully with the Northern States in support of the authority of the National Government and in all just, beneficent, and patriotic designs. This, however, was not deemed sufficient by the dominant party which then swayed Northern opinion and controlled the Government.

The idea of offering an olive branch to a defeated, humiliated, bankrupt, and suffering section was not seriously considered. Measures and policies of disfranchisement, repression, humiliation, distrust, and reconstruction followed one after the other. This long catalogue of severe measures need not be narrated. It would be beyond my powers to portray the poverty, suffering, the shock to society, to social order and peace, to law, order, and property, and to the rehabilitation of our industries which were the natural, the inevitable consequence of this harsh, unfortunate, and senseless policy. Protests were unavailing. Appeals for mercy were not listened to. Passion dominated the hour and was so furious that it would not stop even to consider the suggestion that the interests of the victorious section would be best promoted not by measures of hate and repression, but by broad, generous, kindly acts of statesmanship and conciliation.

This grand truth was obscured in those evil days and is just now beginning to be fairly discerned. Public journals of great ability at the North have lately commented very kindly and fairly upon the fact that despite all obstacles and discouragements the South has made great progress and that her condition is one of advancement and development in the arts and industries; and it is even admitted that this is not due to outside aid and foreign capital, but to the energies of her own sons. It deserves to be considered that this partial restoration of her old prosperity has required some thirty-five years for its accomplishment. Nor ought I to omit to say here that this rehabilitation of the South has been in exact proportion to the relaxation of measures of repression and injustice; and above all, to the regaining by the white people of the local self-government which lies at the basis of all the liberty and most of the progress of this great country. This principle, so important in Massachusetts and Connecticut, is not less important in Mississippi, Louisiana, and South Carolina.

I have referred to these harsh measures of the reconstruction epoch not to revive old animosities, but to show how senseless and

unwise they were, how cruel in their operation, and how unfortunate it would be now to revive and continue the spirit that then shaped Federal legislation. I am glad to recognize the fact that there has been a marked abatement of sectional feeling going on from year to year. It has been very slow—painfully slow for the States which had to suffer from this sectional feeling, and which have yearned and prayed for a better day. Much progress has been made toward a broad national feeling which is able to take in the whole country in the scope of its statesmanship and to study the best methods to benefit and bless every portion of the land. Good men everywhere are rejoicing at this improved, patriotic spirit and this restoration of a real Union.

Are we to be told that this policy of peace is worthless, and that it must be discarded for another measure born of the old days of passion, an act of humiliation and insult, a fresh measure of reconstruction, coercion, and punishment, to be passed in cold blood, without any of the excuses of excitement, misapprehension, and ignorance which may be pleaded in some degree to palliate the legislation that followed the civil war? Sir, I am glad to believe that the politicians who harbor such a scheme do not rightly apprehend the present temper of the public mind, and that they are merely taking counsel of their own perverted passions. If they persist, it will not be long before they will find their mistake. I have no idea that there is in the great Northern States of the Union any demand for vindictive sectional legislation. It is out of date.

Of all the series of harsh measures which were passed in the reconstruction epoch there was not one which bore so hardly upon the Southern people as the forcing of negro suffrage upon them. Some measures were equally humiliating, but not one bore such bitter fruit or entailed such loss and injury to society. The military governments passed away one by one. The carpetbagger was after a while dethroned. Our best and leading citizens had been disfranchised. Some of them were relieved by statute and a still greater number were relieved by death. Other evils and mischiefs were mitigated as time wore on, but the mischiefs which were the result of negro suffrage continued and grew greater year by year.

In a government like our own, resting upon popular suffrage, and embodying the doctrine of local self-government by States, counties, and municipalities, and those embracing most of the subjects pertaining to government, and therefore most intimately affecting human society and happiness, it is of vital consequence that the ballot should be given to all of those who are fit for it, and that it should be denied to those who by ignorance, vice, passion, or other cause, are not qualified to exercise suffrage with safety to society. If these rules prevail, free popular government and representative government is possible and will long endure. Such a government may be, and usually is, eminently conservative. It affords the best guarantee for order, stability, and progress. Capital, labor, property, and all great interests are rendered more secure than under kingly rule. I admit that long before suffrage was given to the black race you could find in every part of the Union a certain percentage of the white race who were uncertain or dangerous votes, but they constituted only a small fraction of the body politic, and it was an easy matter for the more orderly and conservative classes of society to control the elections.

Prior to the civil war hardly anyone ever thought of suggesting that the entire mass of the negroes should have the ballot. It was claimed by many persons that slavery was an evil, a great evil; that it ought not to be extended, but restricted by the agency of the National Government to its existing bounds; but no party proposed to confer suffrage upon the negroes. It was not until after the war had closed that in an hour of passion and folly this fatal policy was determined on. To appreciate the meaning and consequence of this measure of negro suffrage I would remind you that its operation did not affect the North except to a very slight degree. There may have been in some of the Northern States 1 or 2 per cent of the whole population who were blacks. It was an experiment on which the North could enter without any fear of the consequences to themselves.

It was far different with the Southern States. There in a number of States the negroes constituted a very large element of the population—in some States perhaps a fourth, in others over a third, in others half, or even a majority. In South Carolina and Mississippi the negroes constituted a decided majority. In my own State of Louisiana they constituted, in 1870, over one-half of the population. If you assume, as I think you may, that 5 or 10 per cent of the white population in some States, both North and South, are unsafe depositories of political power, you have, with this large addition of negroes to the ballot, as great a danger to the best interests of society as can well be imagined.

A union of the worst class of the whites and of the whole mass of the blacks is always to be feared, as experience has demonstrated. This union means not infrequently the absolute possession of the political power of the State, the passing of bad laws, the defeat of

good measures, the abuse of the taxing power, the squandering of the public revenues, debt, extravagance, and corruption in every form, the prostitution of the executive power to bad ends, and the sale or maladministration of justice. Peace under such a régime is impossible. Public order, domestic security, the safety of property rights, economy and purity in government, all these are impossible under such a system. I say "impossible," and I say it deliberately. Poison the stream of power at its fountain head and bitter waters are sure to flow. No one can expect a different result.

These dire results follow not only in the State governments, but in the governments of the cities, towns, and counties. And here let me say that even in the States where the white race is in a majority, as in Alabama, Arkansas, Virginia, and North Carolina, you will find a number of counties, with every natural advantage, where the blacks predominate by two to one, or sometimes four or even six to one. Here a good county or local self-government, as it used to exist all over this Union, is no longer practicable. Probably some of those at the North who favored the extension of the ballot to the blacks had an idea that the blacks would divide just as the whites divide in the Northern States—some blacks going with one party of the whites and some going with another—but this division has very rarely, if ever, happened. The general tendency of the negroes has been to vote solidly as a race and to vote always against the class of whites who by their superior intelligence, social position, character, and property would in any well-constituted society be its natural political leaders.

Putting together all these elements, which go to make up the situation, you have a natural conflict—I had almost said an irrepressible conflict—between the races. On the one hand you have the forces of ignorance, lawlessness, vice, communism in fact and purpose if not in theory, and, to sum up, irresponsibility—all menacing the property, lives, and happiness of white men, women, and children. On the other hand you have the people of intelligence, of substance, of industry, and friends of orderly government; in short, the forces of everything that is conservative. That this last class will tamely submit to the rule of the blacks and the consequent danger to their property, families, and homes is not to be expected by any rational human being. There is not a State in the whole North that would submit to negro rule or that would consent to share political power and local self-government with the negroes if their numbers were as large as with us. There is not a county or a city or a town or village in any Northern State that would submit to such a state of things. Northern men have been going to the South as immigrants ever since the close of the civil war.

With the exception of the greedy adventurers who went South in the first year or two after the war closed, the Northern men who have gone there have acted with the great body of the Southern whites in respect to local and State elections. They did this whether they were Republicans or Democrats. They caught on to the actual situation very quickly. They had no use for Coffee as a ruler, or a civil governor, or mayor, or alderman, or an administrator of justice. They were not willing to have him impose taxes on their property—property acquired by honest industry or lawful trade—nor were they willing to have him disburse the public moneys. They discarded all fanciful ideas of the brotherhood of man and acted on the good old maxim that "self-preservation is the first law of nature."

I believe, sir, that many of the Republican politicians of this generation are now satisfied that a great mistake was made by their predecessors in conferring suffrage by wholesale on the blacks at the close of the civil war. In private this fact is by them often freely admitted. They have been disappointed in the political power that they hoped to secure by it, and I believe that they now see that they have inflicted a serious mischief upon the Southern people without deriving any corresponding advantage, material or political to themselves. Such is clearly the fact, whether they see it or not. The trouble is that political commitments and party pride often stand in the way of a frank acknowledgment of error. If this could be had—if men would recognize the truth of the situation in political conditions and act on it—many of our worst difficulties would speedily vanish.

I owe it to candor to admit that a large class of citizens in the North of conservative opinions and temper supposed that the evils of negro suffrage would be most potent at the beginning of the experiment, and that the blacks would by experience soon learn how to exercise the ballot with safety to the community and themselves. Some of our own people also hoped that as time passed this evil would become less mischievous and dangerous. But this has not been the case. It is now thirty-three years that the South has been forced to undergo this experiment and to bear this frightful burden—at first amid jeering and taunts, then with indifference, and only lately with any degree of sympathy and appreciation.

All this while the negro has not improved as a voter. I mean the average negro, and more especially the large, ignorant, facile,

and vicious class of negroes. Negro crime has not diminished, but on the contrary has greatly increased. This is a fact of grave consequence to all. The homes and families of the whites are to-day in more danger than at any time since 1865. Prior to the civil war and during that struggle there was no danger whatever to homes or an unprotected woman. It may be said that some of the blacks possess not only habits of order but of thrift. In these cases it may be that the possession of the ballot has wrought no mischief, but it is not true that the ballot has produced this result. Long before the act of emancipation there were cases of free negroes living in the South who were industrious and thrifty people. Naturally there are negroes of this sort to-day. Nobody desires to debar this class from the ballot. Their presence and example are of great value to a community.

At this stage of my argument I desire to emphasize the fact that the Southern people have done nothing in their history for over a hundred years to impede the improvement of the blacks, but on the contrary, much to develop his best attributes. Transferred as a slave by Northern and British traders from a condition of absolute savagery and cannibalism in Africa to the Southern planter he became under his new ownership, an orderly, peaceful, useful member of society. No class of laborers in the world were more free from violent or serious crimes than were the Southern slaves prior to their emancipation. After their emancipation they were in every Southern State provided with educational facilities, and this chiefly out of funds arising from taxes imposed on the white race.

The whites are mainly responsible for this system of education. They hoped by it to make the negro a better member of society. In a more important matter they have had the favor of the white race. Every branch of labor in the South has been thrown open to them—labor on the farm, the great plantation, in the work shop, and the mechanic arts. Every negro willing to earn an honest living has enjoyed the good will, assistance, and encouragement of the whites. On no occasion has the poor white man blocked the road to labor by the black man. How has it been at the North up to the other day—in Illinois and, in fact, all the States? How is he treated by the trade unions of the North? Into how many branches of industry at the North is the negro free to enter and to earn his bread? He needs bread quite as much as he needs the ballot.

Sir, I am not afraid to compare the treatment of the negro race by the North and by the South, either before or after their emancipation. We have never closed upon him the door of honest employment. As a slave the negro never lacked for bread, or clothing, or shelter. If he has ever suffered for bread in the South since his freedom began it was not because plenty of people were not ready to employ him. In the courts of the South he has been accorded all his legal rights. I think many of the negroes would prefer a jury of whites to try them to a jury composed of their own color. The experiment of negro education has been fully tried for over thirty years at the expense of the whites. It has been a costly burden upon a people who were greatly impoverished for many years past.

It is true, indeed, that the whites of the South, after the negro was emancipated, deprecated and opposed negro suffrage. They voted it down about that time by large majorities in many of the Northern States, though there were so few negroes in their midst that their social fabric could not be seriously imperiled by the addition of 1, 2, or 3 per cent of African votes. But logically these Northern States who thus voted down negro suffrage had much more than race prejudice as a basis for their action. They had spread before them the history of the negro race in Africa, the West Indies, and in North America. At no time in the history of Africa had the blacks ever shown the slightest aptitude for self-government or for the arts of industry and peace. Wars, raids, rapine, theft, slavery, polygamy, all forms of lust and vice, superstition, voodooism, cannibalism, all the lowest stages of savagery had marked the history of this race in Africa for thousands of years without exception. From the dawn of history this was his record.

Carried as a slave to New England or to the Southern plantations and subjected to the elevating influences of white civilization and Christianity, the negro had greatly improved in the order of human beings; his moral nature had been developed and his evil passions repressed, but there had been nothing in his history whether at the North or the South to indicate or prove that he ought to participate in the functions of government. The free negroes of New England had possessed considerable educational advantages and much friendly aid, but the people of that section had not deemed it safe to confer a responsible office upon a single one of them.

In Haiti the negroes had revolted and conquered the island. They were then absolute masters. They owned an island second in fertility and natural advantages to none in the world. They had succeeded to a prosperous, well-ordered civilization. They

destroyed it absolutely root and branch. They went back to wars, revolutions, savagery, idleness, superstition, and voodooism. Now was the grand opportunity of the African. Has he shown there the slightest aptitude for governing himself? Has he shown there any fitness to share the rule of an empire or a republic with the white race? Is not the story of Haiti the story of every other West India colony where negro emancipation has been supplemented by negro suffrage and negro supremacy? Do you ask for witnesses? They are legion. Read Froude, or Spencer St. John, or any of them.

I ask you, in the face of such an unvarying experience, whether those Northern States—Republican States—were not right in rejecting negro suffrage as they did? How much more abundantly justified were the Southern States, where the negroes constituted so large a proportion of the entire population. They knew the history of the negro race in Africa and the West Indies quite as well as did these Northern communities, and they had also a far broader and more intimate acquaintance with the limitations of the black race than any other people in the world. They did not cherish any animosity toward the negro, for if he had been the occasion of the civil war he had been the perfectly innocent occasion of it, and was in no wise responsible for what had happened. No clamor or appeal from him incited that dire conflict. The Southern master did not dismiss his old faithful, aged, and worn-out servants when they were emancipated in 1865, though they were a burden to him. He had for all of them kindly feelings, but he did not believe them to be a safe depository of political power. He knew them to be unfit. The South therefore resisted negro suffrage as far as she could.

It was forced upon her finally—how I will not say. She yielded to the coercion of superior force because she was helpless and in order to escape other and, if possible, worse evils. It was a trying, a dreadful hour for these bankrupt and impoverished communities to have such a system forced upon them, but nothing remained to do but to accept it and try to bear up under this fearful burden.

For thirty-five years the South has had to carry this burden. This is more than the usual span of a generation. The history of the experiment in the South shows that with this black cloud hanging over the people immigration is impeded, capital repelled or driven away, property and progress constantly imperiled, crime developed and multiplied, the work of good government embarrassed, and race conflict made a permanent feature of our daily life.

In view of such conditions and such an experience, can any man fail to appreciate the patience, fortitude, and patriotism which has all these years led the Southern people to endure, to forbear, and to hope for final relief? The fifteenth amendment to the Constitution, I have said, and every candid man will admit, was forced upon the South; but it has been accepted there as the fundamental law of the Union, which can not be changed save according to the usual constitutional forms. And this change, however desirable it may be, has not been regarded as capable of attainment. The amendment must needs be obeyed. It reads as follows:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

This amendment can not, I repeat, be infringed upon by any Southern State. The Federal courts, we know well, will maintain it to the fullest extent. But while the suffrage can not be abridged on account of race or color, it may be abridged for felonies, for a failure or refusal to pay lawful taxes, for a lack of sufficient intelligence, for a lack of voting age, or on account of sex, or for any good and sufficient cause applying to both races. Now, I assert that it is the right and duty of any State in this Union which finds the suffrage there extended in such a wholesale manner as to be a constant danger and actual injury to the community to limit that suffrage, provided this be done in a legal, orderly, deliberate manner and in strict conformity to the Federal Constitution. So far it can not be pretended that any of the changes made lately in the State constitutions or laws affecting the suffrage have been made without a careful observance of the forms of law. If the fifteenth amendment be violated, the courts will declare the constitution or law invalid; but up to this time no Federal court has so decided.

The first State to move in respect to this suffrage question was the State of Mississippi. A convention was called there, elected by the people, and assembled in the summer of 1890. They adopted a new State constitution on the 1st of November of that year which contained many admirable provisions. On the subject of the ballot there were two important provisions, which have been well summed up by an eminent lawyer of this body as follows: First. To be a qualified elector one must have paid all taxes which have been legally required of him for the two preceding years, and this payment must have been made on or before the

1st day of February of the year in which he offers to vote. If he owns no property, he must pay a poll tax of at least \$2 if he desires to vote. This poll tax is not a lien on property exempt from taxation, and as very few negroes own more property than is exempt, as to them its payment is purely optional.

Experience has shown that the effect of these tax provisions, though legally applicable to both races, has considerably curtailed the negro vote. Yet these provisions are obviously fair, and tend to confine the suffrage to the industrious and thrifty citizen, though poor, instead of including the idle and worthless class, who pay no tax whatever to the State. There is another provision limiting the suffrage. The elector must be able to read a section of the constitution of the State, or if he can not read he must understand it when read to him, or be able to give a reasonable interpretation of it.

This constitution was sharply criticised in the United States Senate, but was vindicated in a most triumphant manner by Senator George, of Mississippi, who had been the author of the suffrage clauses. He reviewed the constitutions of the New England and other Northern States, and proved by the record that Mississippi had simply followed the precedents they had set. It was an absolute vindication. None of his antagonists has ever attempted a reply from that day to this. This speech of December 31, 1890, by Senator George, deserves to be studied by everyone who cares to understand the history of this question or to form a judgment upon it.

The "understanding" clause, however, was the one principally assailed, but investigation has shown that more blacks than whites have registered under it. The whole question of this constitution came before the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Williams vs. Mississippi*, and was decided April 25, 1898, the court, by a unanimous vote, sustaining the validity of the Mississippi constitution and deciding that it did not conflict with the Federal Constitution. (See vol. 170, U. S. Reports, 213.)

In connection with this adjudication it may be well to recall the fact that for years there was more clamor directed against the Mississippi constitution than against any of the other changes made in the election laws of the Southern States. There is authority for the statement that with the adoption of this new constitution there has been an era of peace, contentment, good order, and progress in Mississippi, and it was stated in debate in the Senate about a year ago that in the very year following this restriction of the colored suffrage, some 10,000 negroes came voluntarily to the State to reside. This was the State of all the South they selected for settlement. There was plenty of work there, kind treatment, and very little politics. What a light does this throw on the question under consideration!

I may remark, also, that the poll tax of \$2 imposed on every voter is appropriated by the State constitution exclusively to common schools; that the negro gets his share of the benefit, and that it is almost his only contribution to this fund.

The State of Mississippi suffered under this experiment of wholesale negro suffrage for about twenty-three years before she changed her State constitution so as to provide an intelligence and tax test for all voters. My own State of Louisiana suffered more from this cause than any Southern State except possibly South Carolina, but it was not until May, 1898, that she modified the suffrage clause of her constitution. She bore the evils of this cruel experiment for over thirty years. I am very sure no one can find in this long-suffering and patient endurance of a great evil any evidence of a disposition to run counter to the sentiment of the dominant party, however erroneous it might be, or to infringe, even in appearance, upon the prohibition of the Federal Constitution.

There is no infringement of the United States Constitution, no denial of suffrage in it anywhere on account of race or color. There are intelligence, property, and tax tests, but these are applicable to both races and to all men. The male citizen of Louisiana in order to become an elector, must possess certain qualifications. He must have been an actual bona fide resident of the State for two years, of the parish for one year, and of the precinct for six months preceding the election. He must be a registered voter. He must be able to read and write. He may use English or his mother tongue. If not able to read and write, he can register and vote if he possesses property assessed at \$300.

If it consists of personal property, the taxes must have been paid. It is further provided that no male person who was on January 1, 1867, or at any date prior thereto, entitled to vote under the constitution or statutes of any State of the United States wherein he then resided, and no son or grandson of any such person not less than 21 years of age at the date of the adoption of the constitution, and no male person of foreign birth naturalized prior to January 1, 1898, shall be denied the right to register and vote by reason of his failure to possess the educational or property qualifications thus prescribed, provided that he shall have resided in the State for five years next preceding the date at which he shall apply for registration, and shall have registered in accordance with this article prior to September 1, 1898. A special regis-

tration is prescribed for this class of voters and all persons not applying before September 1, 1898.

The principal complaint made against the Louisiana suffrage clauses is directed against this clause. It has been developed that of the comparatively limited number of persons who have availed themselves of the privilege it offered were persons who were able to read and write or who possessed property, but who registered under it to induce others to do so.

It is further provided that all persons under 60 years of age desiring to vote must have paid a poll tax for the two preceding years of \$1 per annum, to be used exclusively in aid of common schools. No one is allowed to pay the poll tax of another person, and this offense is justly treated as bribery. Careful provision is made for the right of appeal to the court by anyone denied registration, without cost to the applicant. All votes are by ballot. The sale of liquor on election day or at primaries is prohibited within 1 mile of the voting place.

These provisions of our State constitution make no distinction of race or color. I may ask, Where do they work any injustice to any voters of any race? They, indeed, tend to limit the suffrage to that portion of the population best fitted to exercise it—to orderly citizens who have a stake in the community and to the intelligent classes. The constitution is conservative in its scope, not aggressive or destructive. Is there any fair or thoughtful person who would say that the criminal class—the ignorant, the indolent, shiftless, vagabond element, who never pay taxes—have an absolute, indefeasible right to the elective franchise and to say or prescribe the taxes to be paid by others? Is it not the interest of all the members of the community, good and bad, that the political power of the State should be in the hands of the better and more conservative elements of the population?

More than two and a half years have elapsed since this constitution was ordained and went into operation. There has been ample time, I apprehend, for any person who feels that he has been unlawfully denied the right of suffrage and that in his person the fifteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution has been violated to test the matter in the courts. The State courts are open to such a person. It is his right also to apply to the United States courts. It is noteworthy that no reputable negro or white man has thus applied.

The only case in which an attack is made, even indirectly, on the Louisiana constitution, is a proceeding by a negro named Wright, who was indicted in December, 1899, for the crime of "breaking and entering a dwelling house in the nighttime, armed with a dangerous weapon, and making an assault upon a woman therein residing, with intent to commit rape," a crime made punishable by death under section 850 of the Revised Statutes of Louisiana. Wright was regularly tried and convicted, and, after vainly applying for a new trial, he was sentenced to be hung. Wright, by his counsel, has sought relief through the Federal courts from this penalty, and the case is now pending before the United States Supreme Court.

The ground relied on by his counsel is not any exception to the suffrage clauses of the new constitution, but that the whole constitution of 1898 was and is invalid because it was not submitted to the popular vote for ratification. It is deemed altogether improbable that the Supreme Court will affirm this contention, and even if it should do so, the suffrage clauses are not involved in the decision upon the case. I doubt if any case will ever be brought before the United States Supreme Court to test the constitutionality of the suffrage clauses I have described, but if such a decision should be made by this august tribunal I am confident that the people of Louisiana will promptly conform to it. That the clauses prescribing an intelligence qualification or the payment of taxes as tests will be annulled by this tribunal is hardly within the limit of possibility.

The condition of Louisiana under the new constitution is one of contentment, improved order, and visible progress. I venture to predict that the next ten years, under the new constitution, will develop a better condition of affairs and more improvement than any period since 1865, and it will be due largely to the new State constitution. Why should anyone wish to hinder such a beneficial consummation? Is it not the interest of the whole Union that we should have a good State government in Louisiana?

There has been a great deal of discussion in Congress and in the public press upon the constitutional amendment adopted by the State of North Carolina last summer. This amendment simply affected the suffrage clauses and did not apply to the general features of the old State constitution. It was submitted to the people for ratification, and at a fair, free, and full election it was adopted by a very large majority. I believe, sir, that it was voted for by many Republicans. The complaint made against it is that there is a hereditary clause similar to that of Louisiana, and that under its operation, while some negroes could vote, a much larger number of whites could do so.

This may be the case, but I apprehend that it would be found on trial, as with us, that no very considerable number of persons

would be the beneficiaries of this privilege. This constitutional amendment will not go into operation before the year 1902. There is a requirement of course for registration of all voters. There are also qualifications pertaining to sex, age, citizenship, residence, and freedom from conviction for felony. Section 4 of the amendment says that the person offering to register shall be able to read and write any section of the Constitution in the English language and shall have paid his poll tax on the 1st of March or earlier of the year in which he proposes to vote.

Section 5 provides that no male person who was, on January 1, 1867, or at any time prior thereto, entitled to vote under the laws of any State in the United States wherein he then resided shall be denied the right to register and vote by reason of his failure to possess the educational qualification. But he must register prior to November 1, 1898, and he must also have paid his poll tax. There has been a large majority of white votes in North Carolina for many years past, but in a number of the best counties in the State, and in the commercial city of Wilmington, there has been absolute negro supremacy and a disgraceful condition of affairs under it, to which no New England State would have submitted for an hour. The action of the people of North Carolina was long deferred, but my information as to the conditions that obtained there and my knowledge of what black supremacy involves to the white race convinces me that the people of North Carolina were abundantly justified in the course they have pursued, and that great good to the State will be the result.

These three States—namely, Mississippi, Louisiana, and North Carolina—are the only ones of the South where there have been changes made in the State constitutions affecting the suffrage. In the State of South Carolina complaint has been made of the registration and election laws, but not of the State constitution. This instrument, it is conceded by all, makes no discrimination. Very recently action was brought in the United States circuit court at Charleston against the board of managers of the general election to recover \$2,500 damages for denying the right of Daniel Wiley to vote for a member of the House of Representatives on November 6, 1894. The case came up on appeal to the United States Supreme Court, and was only recently decided. The constitution and laws of South Carolina require voters to be duly registered. It did not appear in the complaint that the plaintiff had ever registered or even applied to be registered.

The Supreme Court consequently decided that because of this omission the complaint did not state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action. The legislation complained of in this action goes back as far as 1882. The State statutes were revised in the year 1893. It is noteworthy that in all these years only one action has been brought to test the validity of these statutes, and that action was dismissed by a unanimous judgment of the Supreme Court. This fact speaks volumes. Yet by the last Crumpacker bill this State is deprived of three members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, the South is not alone in her dread of the evil of giving suffrage to an inferior race and in her desire to limit its evils. I beg leave to remind you of the policy adopted by the general voice of the American people in respect to the Chinese. As an industrious, orderly people, they compare most favorably with the African. They give little trouble to the policemen. They do not commit murders, rapes, or violent crimes. In this respect they constitute no terror to a community or to domestic life. Their intelligence is far superior on the average to the negro. Yet you have denied him the ballot and the privilege of being a citizen. This legislation was adopted at the very time negro suffrage was forced on the South. There was not then, there is not now, any great number of Asiatics in this country. So intense is the feeling of aversion that they are not even allowed to come to the United States as laborers.

Look at the course of Great Britain toward India. There you have 300,000,000 Hindoos, a race much superior to the blacks in intelligence, good order, and industry. They are not allowed any share in the control and government of their own country. One or two hundred thousand Englishmen govern India. There are many harsh features in this British rule to which this people protest, but they are dominated all the same—300,000,000 human beings. Yet we have England constantly paraded before us as an example for our imitation.

Where does the black man come in in South Africa in British dominion or those of the German Emperor? How often does the native vote in Egypt?

Why this unwillingness to accord self-government to the Filipinos and suffrage to everybody in Cuba or Porto Rico? Is it not the result of an idea that the inferior races can not safely be invested with the ballot?

Prior to the year 1874 the blacks voted for years in this District under the eyes of those who had enfranchised them and given them the ballot. They constituted about a third of the voters, not two-thirds, as in a number of counties in the Southern States. The experiment of suffrage worked so badly, the blacks showed

themselves so unfit for it, that, in order to secure decent, orderly government, both parties in Congress combined to abolish the whole system and to substitute a city government by three commissioners. Everybody knows that this was not done on account of any objection to the whites voting, but to get rid of the blacks voting.

There was a universal feeling of disgust at the working of the experiment. The negroes here are far better educated and more intelligent than their brethren of the South, but you will not find the white Republicans of this District or in Congress willing to let them vote. Propose it to them and they would start back in horror. Yet every fair man must admit that this system is safer here, involves less peril, and is more easily restrained than in the States of the South, where many districts are sparsely settled and the work of police proportionately more difficult. Is it too much to ask the Republican Congressmen who own property in this District to weigh the case of the property owner and taxpayer in Louisiana?

It is pretended by some persons that a State should have her representation proportioned to her actual number of voters. How the number actually entitled to vote can be precisely ascertained I am not aware. I know no mode. There may be one. The vote polled at an election furnishes no guide. In the Northern States it often happens that the vote falls off for some cause or other. In 1890, as I see it stated, the State of Massachusetts cast 285,000 votes, but had a vote of 665,000. I could multiply such examples.

The doctrine of the American Revolution of 1776 was that taxation and representation should go together. Under your revenue system taxes fall according to the population. You tax everybody—black, white, rich, and poor. You do not propose to reduce taxation as you reduce representation. I am not willing to see any State punished, whether it be Massachusetts or Mississippi, for an attempt to shut out an ignorant or criminal class from the ballot box. A State that does that makes herself a better member of the Union, and deserves praise instead of chastisement.

We do not fear an investigation of alleged disfranchisement of negroes in the South, if fairly conducted and on nonpartisan lines. The South has nothing to lose by the truth. The Northern people have only been fed on lies and misrepresentations.

I consider that it is almost criminal to thus hold out to the States a premium to debauch and degrade the franchise. Suppose you had in this country a man of talent and power enough to lead public opinion, and that this man was hostile to the great experiment of free government and at heart wanted to substitute a monarchy. How would he go about it? A candid proposal to abolish our form of representative government would be understood and scouted. His best plan, his most effective and ingenious method, would be to induce the people to degrade the franchise, to give the ballot to everybody and anybody, to the ignorant, the vicious, and dangerous classes, and thereby to make free representative government so contemptible in its practical operation that men would be willing to give it up as a failure. Shall we be told that there is no danger of this? Do we not hear on every hand men of force and observation asserting that municipal government in our great cities is already practically a failure?

I believe the people of this country ought to recognize the fact that in this great and vital matter of suffrage each State is the best judge of its own condition and necessities. I should hesitate greatly to criticize any local or suffrage regulations or changes that Maine or Massachusetts or Ohio or California might feel called upon to adopt. I should feel that those people knew far more about the subject than I did. In the South this is preeminently the case. No one who has not lived there can fairly appreciate our condition. It is no simple matter for us to deal with the great problems before us. We have a right to your sympathy, best wishes, and generous aid, instead of hostile and unfriendly criticism.

Let me remind you that here in this country we have, excepting the little mountain land of Switzerland, the only real republic in the world. Nominally there are some others, but practically they are governed by the strong hand. They differ little from monarchies. In view of this fact we should cherish a union of sentiment and affection as well as a mere formal bond, and realize that only by mutual cooperation and good will can this great experiment of self-government be made a lasting success. If it fails, let it not be because of our folly and strife.

I believe and am glad to believe that the spirit of this observation, if not its actual words, is felt by the distinguished man who now fills the executive chair, and that his great influence will be wielded to cement the sections and to leave the country more united than when he first took the oath of his high office. I do not think there can be any doubt as to his position on this subject, though I do not profess to speak for him. I appreciate the kindly and patriotic feeling that prompts him in this regard, and I honor the worthy ambition it displays—an ambition to close his public career with the spectacle of a united people.

War-Revenue Reduction.

SPEECH

OF

HON. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,

OF ALABAMA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, December 13, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 12394) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898, and to reduce taxation thereunder—

Mr. UNDERWOOD said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the war-revenue bill was enacted it was contended that we had neither the time nor the opportunity to revise and readjust with proper care our present system of taxation and to equalize the burden bearing upon the people; that we were engaged in a war with a foreign nation; that the Government needed additional revenue; and it was contended by gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber that immediate action of some kind must be taken, and that the best bill which they could then bring before the House was the bill that would most surely produce the revenues needed for the Government.

That argument at that time, Mr. Chairman, was logical and was sustained by the deficit in the Treasury, but to-day the war with Spain has ceased for two years. We have peace at home and peace abroad. There are no political elections to embarrass the party in power. There is a plethora of revenue in the Treasury of the United States. I ask, has there ever been an opportunity, a better opportunity, for the Congress of the United States, at its leisure, carefully and deliberately to reduce and readjust our revenue so that the taxes will fall equally and justly on the people of this country? I think not. I think with a surplus in the Treasury of \$30,000,000, with the conditions now existing in the country, that they warrant us—nay, more, make it our plain duty—to consider now the entire question of raising revenue, so that the equitable adjustment that was promised to our citizens in the last election may not fail, and that they will not be required to pay unduly in proportion to what others pay.

Now, no question can be raised by anyone that the bill now on the statute books known as the war-revenue bill does not distribute the burdens of taxation throughout the country either in proportion to the wealth or the ability of the citizens to pay. In the first place, it falls on the active, energetic, producing wealth of the country, and what you might term the idle or unproducing capital of this country under the bill remains practically untaxed.

Now, I do not believe in laying the burdens of taxation upon one class to the injury of others. I believe under the laws enacted by Congress every man should bear some part of the burdens of the Government, and that the taxes should be so adjusted that all classes of citizens may bear their fair share. But, Mr. Chairman, if I had the power to write a revenue law, and was compelled to discriminate between the active, producing wealth of the country—between the capital that gives employment to other people and develops the resources of our country—and that class of capital which is unproductive and gives employment to none—the class which does not develop the country, does not add to its resources, does not open up the avenue of wealth in the country, and is merely beneficial to the owners of the property itself—I would discriminate in favor of letting the active, producing capital go untaxed, and lay the burden of taxation on the idle and unused money which is of service to no one but to the owner. I think it would be better for the country if we should discriminate to that extent in our legislation in reference to taxation, and I believe that in doing so we would succeed more nearly in an attempt to do justice than by any other process.

But how is it with the bill now under consideration? There is hardly a tax levied in the war-revenue bill that does not fall on the active business capital of the country. If a man wants to take his surplus means, tie it up in a napkin and bury it under the ground, so far as benefiting his fellow-citizens is concerned by its use amongst them, he practically escapes taxation, and the great millions, invested merely for the purpose of safety in order that their owners may enjoy their profits, pay none of the taxes and escape all of the burdens. It is true that the millionaire when he goes to his bank must put a 2-cent stamp on his check for \$10,000, but he pays no more on that sum than does the humble merchant who draws his check for \$100 or less, because he must pay the same tax on the smaller sum.

It has been said that a great many of the taxes levied under the bill fall upon the productive wealth of the country and that the great bulk of the unproductive wealth is absolutely untaxed.

That is true. When you come to the class of citizens developing the country, conducting its business, they can hardly turn around in their offices that they are not required to remember that they have a Government of the United States which requires them to affix a stamp to some taxed article. While the productive wealth of the country pays the great bulk of the taxes, the unproductive wealth receives the greatest protection.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to seriously criticize the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means in the reductions they have advocated in the pending bill. They propose to reduce the taxes raised by the war-revenue bill to the extent of \$40,000,000. They do not attempt to remodel the tariff schedules or the internal-revenue taxes, and as to such taxes as are left unrepealed in the war-revenue bill they make no attempt to arrange upon a more equitable basis, but merely propose to repeal in full a part of the existing taxation without attempting to fairly distribute the burdens that remain.

Now, if we propose to limit our legislation in the pending bill to a mere horizontal reduction, we should at least attempt to make the bill harmonious in all of its features. It seems hardly fair to say that one industry or one commodity shall pay the bulk of the taxes and others shall be entirely relieved. It is hardly fair to say that some shall be left to bear the burden of this unjust taxation and others bear none. If that is the policy you are going to adopt, then I admit that it is merely a matter of selection on your part.

I am willing to admit that there is no principle involved, if that is what you are trying to do. I agree that if it is merely a question of personal choice on the part of each member of the House of Representatives as to who shall remain to be taxed and who shall go free of all burdens, that selfishness and personal interest will control. When we come to make this selection it is but natural that every man should vote to let his own constituency, or those of his constituents in whom he is most interested, go untaxed and leave the burden of the taxation on others. That is only human nature. We should probably vote the same way on this side of the House if we merely proposed to make this horizontal reduction of \$40,000,000 and go no further.

But the criticism that I have to offer to the pending bill is, first, that the majority of the committee have made no attempt to equalize or adjust the burdens of taxation throughout the country, and next, that they have not reduced the amount of taxes to the extent that the revenues of the country justify.

Now, the gentlemen on the other side contend that we have no better means of fairly and equitably distributing our taxes than those that we find in this bill. I do not think that can be seriously contended. Some of us favor an income tax, and would be glad to see this entire bill repealed and such revenue as is necessary to raise to take the place of the taxes in this bill, if any is necessary, raised by an income tax, whereby the unproductive wealth of the country may bear a portion of the burdens of taxation. But the gentlemen on the other side of the House, when we make a proposition of this kind, say that an income tax is unconstitutional; that the Supreme Court has declared that we can not raise revenue by that means, and that it is idle for us to suggest that we will now raise revenue by a means that the Supreme Court of the United States has said could not be effective.

Well, I will say in answer to that, Mr. Chairman, that when that decision was first rendered the Supreme Court of the United States decided that at least a portion of the income tax enacted under the Wilson bill was constitutional; that it was only after a rehearing and by the decision of one judge that they declared it unconstitutional. I believe that it is a fair and equitable way by which to adjust the taxes of this country, and I do not believe that the American people will be content until they once more at least require the Supreme Court of the United States to render another decision as to the constitutionality of an income tax before recognizing that that means of raising revenue has gone from us.

But if my colleagues on the Republican side of the committee are unwilling to adjust taxation by means of an income tax, then I say they recognize in their report that we do not require more than \$60,000,000 under this war-revenue bill in order to maintain sufficient revenue to prevent a deficit. They recognize the principles of an inheritance tax, because they have properly left it in the bill, and the Supreme Court of the United States has declared that that inheritance tax is constitutional and is a proper means of raising revenue. Well, now, when my friends say that we must continue to resort to these unequal and unjust modes of taxation, I wish to call their attention to the fact that to-day, under the English system of inheritance taxes, the British Government is raising a revenue of \$67,000,000. It is not complained of. It is paid in that great nation. It is paid by the wealth of that great nation as its share of the burdens of the Government. To-day our inheritance tax, as we have written it, only produces a little over \$3,000,000. This country is as great in its wealth and its wealth-producing capacity as are the islands that constitute Great Britain.

We can produce in this country as much revenue from an inheritance tax as the British Government can produce from an inheritance tax, and that form of taxation falls on the unproductive wealth of the country.

No man has the inherent right to the property of another. The people who inherit legacies in this country inherit them under and by virtue of the laws of this country. A man may have a natural right to what he produces, but he has not a natural right to that which was produced by others. Therefore, if we put this inheritance tax on the legacies that are left, we do no injustice to anyone, and we merely make the people who pay it pay their fair share of the burdens of government.

Now, there is no question that the gentlemen on the other side of the House, at this hour to-morrow, when the question comes to a vote in the House, have the power in their hands to wipe out every vestige of the war-revenue bill and substitute an inheritance tax that will produce the amount of revenue that they contend is still needed by the Government. If that be the case, and it undoubtedly is, I ask why should they continue any of these vexations, unjust, and unequal taxes? I can understand no reason, unless it be that they fear the great wealth of this country, and would rather legislate to let it go untaxed than they would to relieve the plain merchant and the plain farmer and the average citizen of the United States from the unjust burdens under which they are now suffering.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Does not the gentleman understand that many of the States are now levying heavy, burdensome inheritance taxes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Why, certainly, I understand that.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Does the gentleman believe in oppressive duplicate taxation?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to my friend from Connecticut that I understand that fully. I do not believe in duplicate taxation. I do not believe in oppressive taxation; but I say when you put the great burdens of taxes on the poor, and allow the accumulated wealth of the country to go untaxed, then you are levying unjust taxation.

We can not control the forms of taxation by the States. The taxes levied by the State governments have nothing whatever to do with the taxes levied by the National Government.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Right there. Many of the States have been levying this tax for a long term of years, have they not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I admit that many of the States do levy this tax.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. The National Government now steps in and duplicates that taxation. Does the gentleman think that fair taxation?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We have in many of the States this form of taxation.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. But it is prior to the Government tax.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know that the State of Alabama or the State of Connecticut can preempt the right of taxation from the Government of the United States, and I have never heard of any such theory as that advanced. If it is a just tax in the State of Connecticut that men should pay on their wealth and property in proportion to that which they have, then I say the principle is the same as to the United States Government. If it is just that the great wealth in your State should bear its proportionate share of the burdens of taxation, I say that it is just in the United States at large that the great unproductive wealth of this country should bear its proportionate share in the taxation also.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I do not suppose the gentleman would take the whole of the legacies?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The State can relieve its citizens.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Why, certainly, as my friend from Tennessee suggests, if the State thinks that its citizens are being unjustly dealt with, it can remove the State tax after we have levied the national tax.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Only 21 States have levied it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Only 21 out of 45 have levied it. They have a right to recede if they think the burden is too great. If they do not think it is equitable and just they can reduce it in their State.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. And the United States could reach 45 States.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We will reach all the citizens of the United States by the same means that they are reached in the State of Connecticut.

Now, the other question and the other proposition, with which we disagree with the report and bill brought in here by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, is that there is no reason why this war-revenue tax should be continued at all as to the great number of items that are in it. There are some kinds of taxation that we find in the war-revenue bill, such as the inher-

ance tax, that we do not think should be repealed at all. We think they should forever stand upon the statute books as part of the means by which we should raise the revenues of this country; but I do not see why the great bulk of the taxes, the vicious and vexations stamp tax as a whole, should not be removed. The gentlemen who represent the majority of the committee contend that it is impossible to reduce the revenues of this country more than \$40,000,000, and to sustain themselves they refer to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, in which he contends that we will only have a surplus in 1902 of \$26,000,000.

Well, now, Mr. Chairman, I have not been able to satisfy myself how the Secretary of the Treasury can reach that conclusion. In the first place, he states that the amount of revenue now produced by what is known as the war-revenue bill is \$105,374,000 and that for the present year—when it is not an estimate, but is an accomplished fact—the revenues raised by the Government will be \$669,595,000 and that the expenditures will be \$590,068,000. This leaves a surplus for this year of \$79,527,000. Now, that is the estimate for the present year, contemplating the expenditures as given by the Secretary of the Treasury himself. For next year (1901) he estimates the revenue at \$687,773,000 and the expenditures at \$607,773,000, leaving a surplus at the end of next year of \$80,000,000. Now, there is an accumulating surplus in the next two years of \$160,000,000 in addition to the \$140,000,000 that we now have as a surplus in the Treasury of the United States. When he comes to the year 1902 he admits that the revenues will increase, and he estimates that the revenues of the Government will be \$716,623,000, but he also estimates an enormous increase in the expenditures by the Government, stating that our expenses for that year will be \$693,374,000, or an increase from 1901 of \$87,000,000. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand how it is possible for the Secretary of the Treasury to come to that conclusion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Has the Secretary of the Treasury ever stated what the items were that would constitute that increase?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In his report, on pages 11 and 12, he states what the expenditures will be in the two different years. In one case, for 1901, he bulks them; in the other case he separates them, so that it is impossible from his report to ascertain exactly where the increase comes in.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. He renders us no itemized account of the increase?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Mississippi states it correctly.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. He does not include anything for the sinking fund?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He does not include anything for the sinking fund. I have taken my pencil and figured it down, and as far as I can ascertain I find that he estimates that the increases of 1900 are \$10,868,000 for the Navy of the United States, and he estimates that there will be a decrease of \$26,431,000 for the military establishment of the United States, making a total decrease in the combined expenditures of the Army and Navy of the United States of \$16,000,000. As I understand, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in making his opening argument in this case the other day in answer to some questions, he stated that we still had an army in the Philippines, and that we had to carry an army there and bring it back.

But I say that the army that is there now of 100,000 men will cost no more to maintain, or cost no less to maintain, than the army that will be sent there if we need regulars. Regulars eat no more and produce no more expense than volunteers, and more than that, the Secretary of the Treasury has made his estimate for carrying that army there and bringing that army back. He has made the estimate, as I have stated, that the military and naval arms of the Government, both taken together, although one increases and the other diminishes, as a whole, there will be a decrease of something in the neighborhood of \$16,000,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that being the case, I ask where he gets his increase of \$87,000,000 in expenditures? It must come from the civil side of the Government. The civil establishment of the Government must make this increase of \$87,000,000, if not more, because we find a decrease in the military arm of the Government. Is there any reason, any good reason, why this Government should expend \$87,000,000 more of the people's money in 1902 under the civil expenditures than it did this year? I see none. I understand that he estimates, among other things, that there will be an increase in the pension list of \$3,000,000; but on the other hand, the interest on the public debt will decrease \$1,000,000. Indian affairs expenditures will amount to a decrease of \$1,749,000; the postal service an estimated increase of \$13,000,000. But taking all that into consideration, where does he get his warrant for the miscellaneous increase that brings this amount up to \$87,000,000? I can not find it in the figures, and I do not think it is justified.

It is true I find from the Secretary's report that he wants \$50,000,000 carried in 1902 to provide for a sinking fund to redeem the bonds of the United States. Well, now, I do not state it as a

fact, but a suggestion may not be out of place, that possibly in figuring this enormous increase of expenditures, the Secretary believes that at the end of the fiscal year, if we find the money in the Treasury, he will be allowed to pass it to the credit of the sinking fund for the redemption of bonds. I will say that I am not opposed to a sinking fund for the redemption of bonds. I believe the bonds issued by the Government ought to be paid off in a reasonable and equitable way. I do not believe in a public debt of the United States if it can be paid off. But I do say that it is unjust to the people who bore the burdens of the war, the people who uncomplainingly went into their pockets and paid to keep our Army and our Navy in the field against the foreign enemy, to say to them, now that peace has come, you must continue to bear these burdens in order that you may not only pay the Spanish war debt, but that you must go back and pay the civil war debt. I do not believe that this is just and I do not believe that it is equitable, but it is the only warrant that I can see that justifies the Secretary of the Treasury in saying that the expenditures of this Government will increase \$87,000,000 in 1902.

I hold in my hand the estimates that are prepared by the clerks of the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate. These estimates are the basis on which we write the great appropriation bills for the Government. The House of Representatives in the past has always considered that these estimates were reliable, and those gentlemen understand their business, and know what are the needs and wants of the Government. Now, in sustaining the proposition that I have contended for, that there is no reason to believe that there is going to be an increase of expenditures of \$87,000,000 in 1902, I want to call your attention to what this estimate, as made for the House and Senate to base its appropriation bills, says. It gives the comparison of the estimates of the regular appropriation bills and the annual appropriation bill for 1901 and 1902. It estimates an increase in the Agricultural Department of \$336,793; for the diplomatic and consular service, \$1,790; District of Columbia, \$1,422,930.63; fortifications, \$732,225; Indian affairs, \$2,450,044.57; legislative appropriation, \$380,239.52; Military Academy, \$343,457.19; Navy, \$12,926,921.61; pensions, \$15,000; Post-Office Department, \$10,489,549; rivers and harbors, \$5,136,258.69; making a total estimated increase of \$34,261,239.21.

But now listen to the estimated decrease. They estimate a decrease in the Army of \$14,693,089.34, and in the sundry civil appropriation of \$6,694,594.41, but for the permanent annual appropriations a decrease of \$8,354,000, making a total decrease in the estimates for 1902 of \$29,741,683.75.

This subtracted from \$34,261,239.21 leaves a total increase, as estimated by these gentlemen, for next year, the fiscal year of 1902, of only \$4,519,555.46.

Now, when these gentlemen, these experts, who have prepared the tables from which the appropriations are made in the House and Senate, after carefully compiling the data before them, estimate the annual increase of our revenues and the annual decrease in the necessary expenditures, you find that they state in this circular that the total increase for 1902 over the estimates of 1901 will only be \$4,519,555.46.

There are the figures, gentlemen, upon which your appropriation bills are to be based. In considering this question of a reduction of revenue, the wiping out of this unjust taxation, are you going to take as your guide the estimates of the Secretary of the Treasury, or are you going to base your judgment, as you have in the past, and as you will when the appropriations are actually before the House, on the estimates which are made by the experts who prepare our appropriation bills? I have no doubt that when the appropriation bills come in you will say that these estimates are all right. Why should you not say so to-day when the question is one of reducing taxation? If there is to be only a general total increase throughout the country of between four and five million dollars, with a surplus this year of \$79,000,000 and a surplus in 1901 of \$80,000,000, with a surplus in the Treasury to-day that has come over to us from the past of \$140,000,000, why is it that you can not make a reduction in this war-revenue bill of more than \$40,000,000? I say, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the statements which are made to us, we could, without any difficulty, and with entire justice to the people of the country, who have borne these war taxes, we could wipe out every single item of the war-revenue bill, except the inheritance tax, and not jeopardize the Treasury balance a particle.

Mr. LINNEY. If the gentleman is willing to wipe it all out, what objection can he have to wiping out \$40,000,000?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. None whatever. Let me say to the gentleman from North Carolina that because I can not have my way in all that I think is right, I am not going to refuse to travel with you on your road as far as you will let me, and if we can not adopt an amendment making this reduction of taxation more than \$40,000,000 I expect to vote to take off the \$40,000,000 of unjust taxation from the backs of the American people.

Mr. LINNEY. Will the gentleman vote for this amendatory bill taking off \$40,000,000?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from North Carolina has evidently not read the views of the minority of the committee, otherwise he would have seen our statement that we propose to vote for the reduction of \$40,000,000 if we could not get something better. What I am contending for now is that neither justice nor right nor equity warrants the position taken by the majority of the committee. The last resort behind which you have hidden is the condition of the Treasury of the nation. You have lifted up that here, and by a manipulation of figures you undertake to make a bugaboo of it: you undertake to make the people of this country believe that it is necessary to maintain these great and burdensome taxes because of natural and ordinary expenditures, when, as I affirm, there can be no real purpose behind this legislation except an effort to make those who bore the burdens of the war pay the burdens of the war debt as well.

Reapportionment.

SPEECH

OF

HON. E. J. BURKETT,

OF NEBRASKA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, January 5, 1901.

On the bill (H. R. 12740) making an apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Twelfth Census.

Mr. BURKETT said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Listening to one speech that has been made a person would almost conclude that the Burleigh bill was for the relief of the State of Maine, while some other exhibitions on the floor would impel the idea that the whole matter was for the relief of pent-up animosity between members, engendered on other and different occasions.

Maine is concerned in the bill, but the bill concerns a whole lot more than Maine. That State, together with Nebraska, Kansas, and others, may lose a member in this body, but to my mind the whole American people are a great deal more concerned about the larger and more important principle that the whole matter contemplates.

The members could be lost to the State and the State retain its prestige in this House, but strike at the tiny underlying principle and the whole symmetry of Congressional legislation is affected. There is a correctness in all things that must be considered. The incongruities and inequalities of both bills have been ably exposed and ingeniously defended. Each alike are based on what is, to my mind, a wrong theory of figuring.

Considerable controversy has developed as to how the Representatives should be apportioned among the people. As I have listened to the debate as to this method of apportionment I have thought that the farmers of the States of Maine, Nebraska, and Kansas could have given a method that in all instances would have proven equitable and just, for it is a system they have used in every precinct and county convention; that is, apportion the Representatives on a certain number of population, with a Representative for every multiple of the basis taken and one for each major fraction. But instead of this simple and familiar way for the apportionment of members, since 1850 a complicated and unjust, and, in fact, I might say an inadequate, method has been used; that is, by fixing the size of the House and dividing the whole population of the United States by that number and using the quotient derived as a common divisor into the population of the various States, then by giving to the States, in the order of their fraction, an additional member until the whole number of members first designed had been attained.

This, as has been so well shown, oftentimes leaves a majority fraction unrepresented. It may be well to state in passing that the first time this method was used was in the act approved May 23, 1850, an act providing for the Seventh and subsequent censuses and for the fixing of the membership of the House of Representatives and for their future apportionment among the several States.

It will be noticed that the act was passed before the census had been taken and, accordingly, before Congress was able to make an apportionment, and the only thing at that day that Congress could do was to fix upon the number of Representatives in the next House as it did and then provide in the same act that the Secretary of the Interior should apportion the Representatives in the manner that I have previously discussed.

Since that time this method has been followed in the main, although in not a single instance has it been followed entirely and exclusively, for in no case has a State ever been compelled to have a majority fraction go unrepresented.

Two things are done by the bill of the majority of the Committee on Census which attract especial attention. One of them never was done before, and the other but once. The one which was never done before is that in the make-up of the bill of the majority three States are given no Representative for a majority fraction of the ratio. Without exception, Congress has always given representation to every majority fraction. Also, the bill of the majority reduces the representation of some of the States below that which they now enjoy. With one exception, this has never been done before.

As an illustration of the unfairness of the system of figuring upon which the majority bill has been based, attention has already been called to the States of Colorado and Maine. The first of these States, for example, would be entitled to 3 Representatives in a House of 350 members, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, and 356 members; but when the House was made 357, then, by their system of figuring, Colorado would only be entitled to 2 members; while if the House were raised 1 more, or to 358, they would then be entitled to 3 members.

Maine, for example, would be entitled to 4 members if the membership of the House were 387 or 388, but she would be entitled to only 3 Representatives with a House of 389 or 390 members. Yet upon this inadequate, unjust, unfair, and unsatisfactory system, condemned by all men at all times, the "holy" apportionment of the bill of the majority is computed.

This incongruity has been observed before, and has heretofore been termed the "Alabama paradox." In a letter to the Superintendent of the Census, transmitting to him some tables and computations exhibiting the apportionment of the Representatives among the several States, as ascertained in the Tenth Census, which letter bears date October 25, 1881, the chief clerk has this to say:

While making these calculations I met with the so-called "Alabama paradox"—that Alabama was allotted 8 Representatives out of a total of 299, receiving but 7 when the total became 300.

Such a result as this is to me conclusive proof that the process employed in obtaining it is defective, and that it does not in fact apportion the Representatives among the several States according to their respective cases.

Also, I would call the attention of the House to a point in the report of the Census Committee ten years ago. From page 3 of that report I read:

The old and new methods of computation were used. These methods are explained elsewhere in this report, and tests were made until a number was found with a given ratio that in application would secure each State against any loss in its representation and in no instance leave a majority fraction. This number was found to be 356.

This indicates two things: First, the determination of the House not to reduce the representation of any State nor to leave any majority fraction unrepresented, and second, that an apportionment based upon the new method alone was unjust, and computations by that method alone were deemed to be insufficient and inadequate for the occasion.

The Burleigh bill apportions the members as the committee did ten years ago, with both methods in view; and I might add that by giving a Representative for every 194,000 population and one additional member for each majority fraction thereof the results would be exactly as the Burleigh bill apportions it, with the exception of the State of Iowa, which, under that figuring, would be entitled to one more Representative than the Burleigh bill gives.

It is safe to say that after all the trials and the attempts to do justice there is no figure at which the two systems of computation will attain so nearly the same result as the number 386.

The objection to the Burleigh bill by those who oppose it is only one, of course, that it makes the membership too large, and this objection is based on three reasons, and only three.

First, that the size of the Hall will not permit an increase of membership. Second, that increased membership increases expense. Third, that an increased membership means an unwieldy body.

Let us consider them in their order. First, the size of the Hall prevents an increase of membership. We are unwilling to admit that the popular branch of a popular Government of 76,000,000 of people, growing in size, in influence, and in power, should be limited by the inanimate walls of wood and stone; and were the statement true that the additional members could not find accommodations in this Hall, which is not true, as the plans provided by the Architect of the building demonstrate, still we would maintain that it is only begging the question to insist that the proportion to which the people shall be given representation must be determined by the size of the accommodations provided in advance. The additional members can still be provided for and still leave room unoccupied. If it were necessary, several thousand feet of cottonwood lumber and other kinds of lumber, made into desks, might be removed with good effect as to decorum in the House. A great many changes could be made to give more room, but it is unnecessary, for on the 12th day of last month we had seated comfortably in this Hall, with the desks as they now are, 700 people.

The second objection is that it would increase expense. Yet some of the members who are opposing the measure on the ground

of expense would still vote to erect a dam across "Mosquito Creek" in their district at five times the cost, that a sand barge could do business for a mile or two on the backwater. If the people are entitled to this representation the item of expense fades into insignificance, comparatively speaking.

The third objection is that an increased membership makes the body unwieldy. Unwieldy to whom? To the members, or to those who would manage the members? As has been demonstrated in the past, as the membership of the House increases new methods must be called into requisition for doing business, and as we read the history of the House we have found that methods adequate have always been found. It is necessary at times to limit the number of dumb animals that can be put in one shed or one corral for their own safety, but it is a reflection on the genius of man and the qualities that differentiate him from the lower animals to believe that they can not commune together in unlimited numbers and accommodate themselves to the changed conditions of changed surroundings.

The bill of the majority will leave the size of the House the same as before. It changes the apportionment and, as I have observed, it takes from the agricultural States and adds to the commercial States. Aye, the additions are to the commercial ends of the commercial States. It is the city that is profiting by the apportionment. The power of numbers is being transferred from the rural to the urban parts of the country. Some one replied to me the other day, in response to this suggestion, that if the cities increased it is right that their representation should be increased. I admit it. When cities grow their representation should and will grow; but the unfairness of the bill of the majority is that it imposes a penalty on the agricultural portions of the country at the same time it rewards the commercial districts. We are willing that New York should be rewarded for her increase in population, and that Chicago, that young giant of the West, should be rewarded for her magnificent growth; but we do object that Maine, Nebraska, Kansas, Virginia, and other agricultural States should likewise be punished. In short, we are willing that New York and Illinois should gain, but unwilling that these other States at the same time should lose. We are willing that New York should be rewarded for her gain by an increase in her representation of 5 per cent, but we are unwilling that for her growth Maine should be reduced 25 per cent and Nebraska 16½ per cent.

We do not like to see Nebraska, with 10,000 more people than she had ten years ago, have one less member of Congress to represent her simply because she has not grown as rapidly nor in the same volume as New York City and Chicago.

One of two things must be done—either the size of this House must be kept abreast with the onward march of the increasing population of the United States or the representation will finally be corralled in the cities. There is every apparent evidence of this, not only at the present time but in the past. Only a few years since the State of Maine had 8 Representatives; to-day she has left 4, and the advocates of the majority bill would see her even further reduced. Connecticut once had 7; New Hampshire, 6, and Vermont 6. Iowa ten years ago was given 11 members on 11 full measures of the ratio; but to-day she gets her eleventh member on a majority fraction slightly in excess of a moiety. Thus, while Iowa is apparently losing nothing, in fact she is. But a distinguished leader from one of these large cities said to me the other day: "What is the difference? Your States occupy the same relative position in the House." But the statement is not correct. Maine with 3 members in a House of 357 has 1 for every 119, while with 4 in a House of 386 she has 1 member for every 96. Nebraska with 5 members in a House of 357 has 1 for every 71 Representatives, while with 6 Representatives in a total membership of 386 she has 1 for every 64.

There is a limit to the population of a purely agricultural State, while the same is not true of commercial States or States in which there are large cities. If the former would retain their power in a considerable degree they must insist that they be not punished for their failure to grow in the same degree that commercial States grow.

There is another matter to which I would like to call attention. I glance into the Congressional Directory and I find that on the Rivers and Harbors Committee, which we are told will soon bring in a bill appropriating about \$60,000,000, aside from Minnesota and Texas, there is not to be found a single member living between the Mississippi River and the Pacific coast. On the Committee on Pacific Railroads there is not a member west of Iowa, except the Representatives from Texas; on the Appropriations Committee there is only one member west of the Missouri River, and on the Ways and Means Committee there are only three States represented west of the Missouri River, while, on the other hand, on the Committee on Public Lands there is scarcely any one east of the Mississippi River.

I call attention to this not to suggest any improper apportionment in the organization of the committees, for doubtless every

man appointed on any of these committees is entitled to that appointment for some very good reason. I call attention to it to suggest that each portion and section of the country should be represented on these great committees. And yet there are not enough members to adequately represent every portion of the country on every one of these committees. The legislation of the House is done by committees. When the Committee on Appropriations brings in a great bill, carrying millions of the people's money, we vote it through knowing very little of the bill. It is impossible for one not a member of the committee to understand the bill thoroughly. How important it is, then, that each section should have a member on that committee. Then, too, since the legislation is done by committees, it is all the more necessary and proper that the committees should be larger. Instead of 17 members we should have 25 or 30 members, to the end that all important legislation may have careful consideration by representatives not only from every section of the United States, but of diversified interests, inclinations, and ideas.

I maintain that the committees, instead of being too large at present, are too small; in short, that too small a section of the country gets an opportunity to do effective thinking and legislating on any of this great part of national legislation.

But after all this has been said and done the question that appeals to us squarely is, Is it right? Is it for the greatest good to the greatest number? We have a popular Government, and the only place that we can really say that the Government touches the people is in the House of Representatives. The Executive Department is far removed in every-day life from the great mass of the American people. The judiciary is unknown and unheard of to the most of them. This end of the legislative branch is the only point where it can be said that the Government touches the people. It is the people's branch; the popular branch.

A person on coming to Washington inquires for "our" Senator, but he says "my" Representative. He shakes hands with his Representative, greets him cordially, and asks for a letter of introduction to the Senator from his own State. This is the people's end of the Government. Shall we take it from them?

The question is, Shall we make this body more exclusive? Shall we draw it farther from the people? In short, shall we take from the people of any State that which they already have? Is it politic? Is it proper? Is it right? Merely for our own ease and comfort, for our own convenience in transacting the people's business, shall we withhold from them that further opportunity which is their due—to be close to this, their branch of the Government?

The country will not stand still in commerce, in power, nor influence. Her people progress intellectually and morally and increase in numbers. Added numbers makes added needs. With more intelligence and better morals, their wants are multiplied. We must keep abreast with the procession and respond to the demands for better representation. This can not be done by adding more work to fewer people. The Burleigh bill is only in keeping with past legislation along this line, and should pass.

The Grout Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERMAN B. DAHLE,

OF WISCONSIN.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 7, 1900,

The House having under consideration, as in Committee of the Whole, the bill (H. R. 3717) to make oleomargarine and other imitation dairy products subject to the laws of the State or Territory into which they are transported, and to change the tax on oleomargarine—

Mr. DAHLE said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I am here before you as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, before which committee the Grout bill was placed, and representing the Second district of Wisconsin, which is a part of one of the 32 States of our Union which have passed laws against the sale of colored oleomargarine. I stand here as one of the number who will vote for the reduction of the tax on oleomargarine for the poor and will vote for a tax of 10 cents a pound on colored oleomargarine for the well-to-do. I stand before you representing the patrons of the 250 or more creameries of my district. I stand before you as one of the representatives of the 5,000,000 or more farmers who are interested in their butter product having fair play and not being crowded out, as it is now in many instances, by the unlawful sale of colored oleomargarine. What we propose and wish to do is to reduce the tax on uncolored oleomargarine to one-fourth of a cent a pound, for the benefit of those who may work hard and yet not have

much to buy with, and to have a tax of 10 cents a pound on colored oleomargarine, making the cost of a good quality oleomargarine made in imitation of butter somewhat near the average price of good creamery butter, the average price of such butter ruling somewhat higher than the cost of oleomargarine with the 10-cent tax added.

There are many points at issue in this bill that have been considered by our Committee of Agriculture and are now for us to consider here.

IS OLEOMARGARINE SOLD ACCORDING TO LAW?

I will first talk on the subject, Is oleomargarine now sold according to law? and if we find it is not, then it is certainly our duty to pass some bill, so that it will be sold according to law by manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers. This we should do for the protection of the manufacturer and consumer of butter alike. On this subject Mr. John Dadie, representing W. J. Moxley, Chicago, Ill., a corporation for the manufacture of butterine, stated:

I join issue with the statement that large quantities of oleomargarine are sold as butter; the records of the Internal Revenue Office show that out of the 80,000,000 pounds marketed in the United States last year only 1 per cent of it was sold in violation of law.

Representative NEVILLE asked: All that has been sold by the retailers with the manufacturers' sale amounted to only 1 per cent of the total amount sold?

Mr. DADIE, Yes, sir.

On this subject Mr. W. E. Miller, representing Armour & Co., Kansas City, Kans., said:

It has been represented to this committee that a large per cent of the butterine manufactured is sold for butter. This is a mistake, and can not be proved by facts. Much publicity has been given to the sale of a few packages of butterine for butter, the wrappers of which were branded oleomargarine, but this is not conclusive evidence that all dealers in the United States are practicing the same deception.

We acknowledge that a small per cent of butterine is sold fraudulently, but this is no reason why its sale should be prohibited altogether, simply because one unscrupulous dealer in a hundred may give it to a purchaser when he calls for butter.

Dealers do not sell butterine promiscuously for butter, as is claimed, and if the promoters of this crusade had taken the time and trouble to investigate in the various markets they would have found such was the case. We furnish all dealers selling our butterine with signs. They do not find it necessary to practice deception.

We urge our trade to sell butterine for just what it is, and never encourage or countenance violation. All original packages are branded oleomargarine, and all of our regular brands which are sold under wrapper are also branded oleomargarine. In addition to this the retail dealer must brand the word "oleomargarine" on the outside of the wrapper.

I will also read to you on this subject from the statement of C. N. Lavery, representing Swift & Co., oleomargarine manufacturers, Kansas City, Kans.:

We, as manufacturers, wish to refute in the most emphatic terms the claim that oleomargarine is placed on the market and sold for butter. We, as manufacturers, are encouraging the handling of oleomargarine strictly in compliance with the revenue regulations, furnishing free of charge all necessary stamps for marking packages, signs, notices, etc. That the people want oleomargarine is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the sale in the United States increased from 21,513,573 pounds in 1888 to 83,145,081 pounds in 1899. This increase is not due to the public being deceived and sold oleomargarine for butter, but to the fact that the consumers have learned the value of oleomargarine and ask their dealers for it.

We find that the three representatives of the oleomargarine factories that appeared before our committee, each and every one of them, very freely expresses himself that oleomargarine is placed on the market and sold to the consumer for what it is, Mr. Dadie allowing 1 per cent as being sold for butter by the retailer, Mr. Miller allowing one dealer in 100, Mr. Lavery, as a representative of the manufacturers, refuting most emphatically the claim that oleomargarine is placed on the market and sold for butter, and further claims that the manufacturers are encouraging the handling of oleomargarine strictly in compliance with the revenue regulations.

We will examine a little further into the testimony given by these parties. By so doing I expect to be able to show you that these parties know somewhat differently than first stated by them; that such information leaked out in cross-questioning by members of our committee. We find that Mr. Dadie, in answer to Representative NEVILLE, acknowledges that the firm he represents issued the following notice to the trade, dated April 5, 1899, which letter is as follows:

In nearly every section of the country there is a difference in the color of butter, and even in certain seasons of the year there is a change, as you will have noticed. In winter butter is of a lighter color than in summer; in many sections this is the result of the difference in feed or pasture. We can give you just what you want at all seasons if we know your requirements.

I have manufactured separator creamery butter for many years, but I have never found it necessary to send my customers such circulars. We can imagine that it might benefit an oleomargarine manufacturer to send out just this kind of a letter to all sections of the country where there are laws against the sale of colored oleomargarine, as well as to other sections where colored oleomargarine can be legally sold, if such manufacturer wants his goods sold everywhere, whether legally or illegally.

We find that Mr. Miller states that the present tax and regulations are sufficient to control the sale of this product, and that butterine is an up-to-date product and possesses sufficient merit to sell successfully throughout the world for just what it is. We need only to take the Nebraska instance to prove the inconsistency of his arguments. Starting out, as he does, by stating that

the present tax and regulations are enough, he then has to acknowledge that his firm disposes of their product in that State where they know it must be sold illegally.

Mr. Miller is questioned by Representative NEVILLE as to whether he sells oleomargarine in Nebraska:

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; we sell some there.
Representative NEVILLE. Do you not sell a good deal of it from Kansas City into Nebraska?

Mr. MILLER. Well, it could not be called a great deal, because it is not a very large market. We sell considerable, yes.

Representative NEVILLE. Now, is it not true that every pound of colored oleomargarine that is sold in Nebraska is sold in violation of law?

Mr. MILLER. Well, that may be—yes.

He says that "oleomargarine possesses sufficient merit to sell successfully throughout the world for just what it is." Let us take him at his own word. If oleo is a product that has merit, and people want it, let us place the additional tax on it, so that the price of both will be about the same, there will be no temptation to sell it for butter, and those who prefer it can get it and know what they are getting.

We will now consider the statement of Mr. Lavery. We find that he shows our committee samples of wrappers for packages of oleomargarine, calling our attention to the fact that the word "oleomargarine" is plainly printed on each of those wrappers, the size of the largest letters in the brand being in compliance with the internal-revenue regulations.

But we find, when he is questioned more closely, that it is not all of their rolls and prints that are put in such wrappers; we learn that some are placed in a cloth wrapper, which wrapper is not branded at all; and it looks to me that the reasonable conclusion is that these manufacturers do not care a whit for the law; they simply want to sell their goods. In the States where the sale of colored oleomargarine is unlawful, as well as in the States where it is lawful, we find that Mr. Lavery, on being cross-questioned, stated—and I think very thoughtlessly—that they have salaried representatives all over the country. Gentlemen, that does not sound to me as though these manufacturers of oleomargarine care to live up to the law, when we remember that 50,000,000 of our people are living under law prohibiting the sale of colored oleomargarine.

If these manufacturers and their customers, the retail dealers, want to sell the goods for what they are, then good and well, put the rolls or prints in properly-marked paper wrappers, and if the same parties wish to sell these goods for something they are not, but for something they are made to imitate, namely, pure butter, then do as Mr. Lavery informs they do with a part of their product, put it in plain wrappers without any mark whatever on the roll or print or the wrapper.

Along this line Mr. Lavery answers Representative ALLEN by stating:

We have some trade which does not care for the printed wrapper for reasons of its own. Of course we are in business to give the people what they want, and we do not refuse to fill their orders for plain-paper prints.

This reminds me of the samples of oleomargarine that were brought from Chicago before our committee. The word "oleomargarine" was so indistinctly printed that not any one of the members of our committee could make out the word "oleomargarine" on some of them; and I can state that I saw with my own eyes in Chicago, boxes containing assorted, colored, sized, and shaped rolls, put up to imitate butter as nearly as possible.

I can imagine, if this product was put up by the manufacturers to be sold for oleomargarine, and not for butter, that the rolls or prints would have been of the same color, style, and size. If, however, more than one size had been desired, there might, at most, have been two sizes and not a large number of sizes, just as there always are in the ordinary roll butter of trade. This, however, was not roll butter, as roll butter was at the time worth more wholesale than was asked for this product at retail.

Representative NEVILLE questions Mr. Lavery as follows:

In those States which have laws prohibiting the coloring of oleomargarine in imitation of butter, will you explain how you sell oleomargarine as such, and yet colored as butter, without violating those laws?

From what Mr. Lavery started out declaring I would naturally expect that he would not give any answer at all to this question. And here we also must remember that Mr. Lavery stated a short time previously "that we have salaried representatives all over the country;" and in answer to Mr. NEVILLE he said:

I can only say that the people want oleomargarine even in the anti-color States, and regardless of the fact that there are laws on the statute books prohibiting the sale of the product colored yellow there is such a demand for it that in a great many of the States there is very little attention paid to the enforcement of the law.

When I think over this answer of Mr. Lavery, I can only conclude that these manufacturers know all about the transgression of our oleomargarine law, and more than that, that they, through their salaried representatives all over the country, are the worst and most guilty violators of the law themselves.

We have heard the testimony of the representatives of the oleomargarine industry, three in number, all starting their testimony with great courage, as though all right and justice were on their side and as though these manufacturers all lived up to our present law; but, upon being cross-questioned, every one of them breaks

down, so that we must conclude from their testimony that parties engaged in this industry are all transgressing the laws of our Commonwealths.

Upon this same subject we have the testimony of Commissioner of Internal Revenue Wilson. I can not say that I found the Commissioner was especially favorable to our point of view. He did, however, state that "we have had considerable complaint from some of the dairy associations about the failure to enforce the law." He further states that this law is, as with respect to collecting the tax, better enforced than any other internal-revenue law, but with respect to the individual matter so far as the pure-food law is concerned, no.

Among others who appeared before our committee in the interest of oleomargarine was W. B. Cheek, vice-president of the Live Stock Exchange of Omaha, Nebr.; yet, in answer to our chairman as to whether he knew anything about the retail sale of oleomargarine in his city, he answered:

Yes; it is sold openly in the groceries and butcher shops as oleomargarine. For instance, in my shop where I buy meat is a table, and on that table is butterine in boxes and tubs and stacked up outside of the boxes, marked all the way from 12½ cents to 18½ cents.

And in this State, we must remember, every pound of oleomargarine sold is sold in violation of law.

Now let me read from the statement of B. F. Kimball, of Philadelphia, who appeared before our committee and stated that—

At present in Philadelphia about nine-tenths of the oleomargarine sold is sold as butter.

Mr. ALLEN. Do you know that from personal knowledge?

Mr. KIMBALL. I know it from contact with customers and seeing the product in the stores. We have it in our store for examination. We know that the butter trade has fallen off because of the sale of oleomargarine fully 50 per cent.

Mr. DAVIS. In the State of Pennsylvania there are 11,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine sold, and about nine-tenths of it is sold as butter. The only State which sells more is Illinois.

Mr. KIMBALL. The butter merchants of Philadelphia are largely interested in creamery products and have no objection to the sale of oleomargarine itself as such. We object to the selling of oleomargarine at butter prices as butter. It is sold at the price of butter, and the sale of colored oleomargarine is unlawful in this State.

We will next hear from Mr. C. Y. Knight, secretary of the National Dairy Union. He says:

In the city of Chicago the city is overrun by people who are selling oleomargarine for butter and for 10 or 15 cents a pound more than it ought to be sold for. Every man who buys butter is not a chemist, and if they want oleomargarine they should buy it for oleomargarine, price 12 or 13 cents per pound. The only reason they pay 20 cents is that they think it is butter—

And the same law in regard to the sale of colored oleo is on the statute book of Illinois.

Let me next read from the testimony of Hon. W. D. Hoard, of Wisconsin, president of the National Dairy Union. He says:

These manufacturers—

The oleomargarine manufacturers—

are assuming to override all law. They stand behind all infraction of State and national laws and furnish money for the defense of their agents when arrested.

I wish to say that I have received letters from very many of the most prominent dairymen of my district asking for the passage of the Groat bill, because we find that the following-named States, with a population of 50,000,000 people, have anti-coloring laws, and yet we find that there were over 5,000 dealers of oleomargarine in these States who unlawfully sold 62,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine last year. Here are the States and figures:

State.	Dealers.	Pounds.
Alabama	21	226,033
California	74	74,923
Colorado	95	1,123,337
Connecticut	5	134,255
Delaware	48	40,455
Georgia	61	495,004
Illinois	2,020	18,638,021
Iowa	3	79,922
Kentucky	217	1,490,577
Maine	17	102,274
Maryland	58	1,701,860
Massachusetts	108	2,083,880
Minnesota	30	1,813,313
Missouri	231	3,133,313
Nebraska	73	1,024,865
New Hampshire	19	443,383
New Jersey	296	5,875,953
New York	14	222,788
North Dakota	18	7,710
Ohio	1,005	8,830,069
Oregon	3	41,250
Pennsylvania	717	11,433,341
South Carolina	24	258,150
South Dakota	4	55,432
Tennessee	83	714,640
Utah	—	8,450
Vermont	—	2,000
Virginia	121	1,150,400
Washington	5	63,345
West Virginia	172	1,206,865
Wisconsin	23	714,742
Total	5,492	62,825,582

I have so many of these letters that I must not take up your valuable time by reading them. Besides these letters I have also received many others from some of the most responsible and trustworthy butter dealers of Philadelphia, Buffalo, Boston, Cleveland, Chicago, St. Louis, Baltimore, Pittsburg, and New York, which are all of the same voice and carry out the same idea. I here beg leave to read the following:

PHILADELPHIA, December 4, 1900.

DEAR SIR: We presume you are aware of the fact that in Pennsylvania there exists an anti-color law, which up until recently has been a dead letter, and even now is to a certain extent, as violators of the law, through eminent legal ability, are always able to find some technical point by which they can prevent guilty sellers from going to jail. Of late we have endeavored to interest the agricultural elements of our State in this matter, and have partially succeeded, but the great trouble we find is that the manufacturers of butterine and oleomargarine are able to counteract any efforts we are able to make in some manner or other, and it is certainly very discouraging with such a state of affairs existing.

We can see no way in which the evil can be reduced to a nominal extent except by national legislation, and we are firmly of the opinion that the Grout bill will cure this evil. We would like you to understand that we are not biased against the sale of the commodities in this market. We believe that oleo should be sold on its merits, but when this is attempted it can not be disposed of to advantage. The trade here wants butter or a substitute that looks like it, and when it comes through in its original color it is practically impossible to dispose of it profitably.

Yours, very truly,

HON. HERMAN B. DAHLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MOFFIT, WENTWORTH & CO.

PHILADELPHIA, November 16, 1900.

DEAR SIR: I know of no better means of regulating the sale of oleomargarine than the Grout bill, except to prohibit the manufacture of the article entirely.

This State has tried both prohibitory and license laws regulating the sale, and neither law has prevented the sale of it as butter. Of the sales of oleo, as high as 11,000,000 pounds in a year, I might say all was sold or consumed as butter.

The State laws to regulate the sale of oleomargarine after it leaves the factory have proved to be very hard and very costly to enforce; the easiest and best way is to regulate the sale of it at the factory as proposed by the Grout bill, which allows the manufacturer to supply the poor man with oleo in its natural color and at its legitimate price, not as a counterfeit and at butter prices.

With the passage of the Grout bill the sale of butter in this State ought to increase at least 10,000,000 pounds a year, taking the recent sales of oleomargarine as a basis.

Very truly, yours,

HON. HERMAN B. DAHLE,
Mount Horeb, Wis.

JOHN JAMISON.

BUFFALO, N. Y., November 14, 1900.

DEAR SIR: The passage of the Grout bill (H. R. 3717) should be effected at this session of Congress, for without some such law the people of the United States will continue paying tribute to the ring of oleomargarine manufacturers, and will continue eating an imitation at the price of pure butter. In this State we have stringent laws, but they are not enforced. What is needed is a national law that will be enforced. The people at large are paying tribute to the extent of 6 or 8 cents a pound on millions of pounds of the imitation, which profit goes into the pockets of a few manufacturers and unprincipled dealers. The imitation of butter is so good that only a chemist can detect it. A law is needed that will compel manufacturers of the imitation to make the imitation in such color or form that people can not be deceived in it.

Let the oleo be sold for what it is; then there can be no objection to its being sold and there won't be much of it sold, for few will buy it knowingly. It is the experience of nearly all who retail to families that they can only sell oleo by representing it to be pure butter. If the people don't want to be defrauded, why should not Congress come to their relief and protection by passing a law that will give them the protection so much sought for? We earnestly hope you will take special interest in the bill and help to pass it.

Yours, truly,

HON. H. B. DAHLE,
Washington, D. C.

POTTER & WILLIAMS.

BOSTON, November 16, 1900.

DEAR SIR: No doubt but what there is a great deal of oleomargarine being sold in this State to consumers as genuine butter; therefore we see no reason why, by doing away with this substitute or making them sell it for what it really is, it will not benefit the whole butter or dairying interest, tend to raise prices, and do away with a big deception.

Yours, truly,

HON. HERMAN B. DAHLE, Mount Horeb, Wis.

HINCKLEY & CO.

BOSTON, MASS., November 21, 1900.

DEAR SIR: We think it an outrage on the dairymen that oleo should be manufactured and sold as butter to such a large extent as it is. In our Eastern towns and cities there is more oleo sold for butter than you would have any idea of. The competition in these places is so severe that one retailer to compete with his neighbor is taking chances of selling oleo. In our opinion, under present law he is not taking many chances, because if he is arrested he is allowed to resume his business again, and his trial is put off from time to time, and the public get oleo just the same, when they should have butter, for they pay prices of butter, or nearly so, and thus it has its effect on butter. If oleo was sold to the consumer for what it is, and at prices that it would be sold at if known as oleo, he would then derive a benefit in using it, for he would buy it at about 10 cents a pound less than what he now pays, thinking he is getting butter, and would also have the satisfaction of knowing he was eating a substitute.

A neighboring State is a great distributing point of oleomargarine. It is sold throughout the cities of that State quite openly, and a dealer from one of their largest cities recently told us that probably seven-eighths of it was sold as butter, besides large quantities being shipped to other cities.

Respectfully,

HON. HERMAN B. DAHLE.

PATCH & ROBERTS.

CINCINNATI, November 30, 1900.

DEAR SIR: We are very much interested in the passage of the Grout bill, as it is a just bill to all and everybody. Thus far three-fourths of the oleo sold here is sold as butter and butter prices paid for same, whereas if it would sell in its original color, people would buy it for less money and for what it really is.

Very respectfully, yours,

HON. HERMAN B. DAHLE, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

TELKER & DUNKER.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, November 30, 1900.

DEAR SIR: We are in perfect accord with the oleomargarine bill that will soon come before your honorable body for action. We believe it is due the dairying interests of this country that there should be some law regulating the selling of oleo for just what it is, and that people will not be deceived when buying the goods, and we urge upon you the importance of using your influence in the passage of this pending bill.

Yours, truly,

HON. HERMAN B. DAHLE, Washington, D. C.

D. MARTIN & CO.

CHICAGO, November 30, 1900.

DEAR SIR: For nearly two years my time was given almost exclusively to the work before the State legislature here securing the passage of a State law similar to the one which you have in Wisconsin, and in endeavoring to have the law enforced. After a great struggle the law was secured, but we have never been able to enforce it.

The great strength of the oleomargarine business is in and about this city. The bulk of the manufacturing for the United States is done here, and great wealth has been accumulated by those manufacturing it, and they are quite ready to expend that wealth in protecting what they are pleased to term their business interests. A great many arrests were made, but the oleomargarine people succeeded in getting a hearing before certain judges, who, contrary to all precedent, decided the law to be unconstitutional, and tied up the prosecution in such a manner that it was impossible to get the case before the State supreme court, and notwithstanding several efforts have been made to get different cases before the supreme court we have, up to the present time, been unable to do so.

The writer has held the position of president of the Illinois Dairy Union, of which Mr. Knight is secretary, for several years, and we have pushed the prosecution as vigorously as it has been possible to do, and with but very small results.

Oleomargarine, or butterine, is sold openly in this market as butter, and we have not been able to prevent it. In fact, this is the only way in which they seem to be able to successfully handle it. If the trade was confined entirely to selling it as the product that it really is there would be but very little cause for complaint on the part of the dairymen or of the consumers, but innocent purchasers buy the greater part of the product when they are supposed to be buying butter.

We think that the Grout bill now before Congress is admirably adapted to the situation, and is one to which the friends of pure food should rally all their strength.

Yours, very respectfully,

HON. HERMAN B. DAHLE,
Washington, D. C.

GEO. W. LINN COMPANY,
GEO. W. LINN,
President and General Manager.

CHICAGO, ILL., November 19, 1900.

DEAR SIR: It is a well-known fact that fully 90 per cent, if not more, of all oleomargarine sold by retailers is not sold for what it is, but palmed off to the consumer for the genuine article—butter. Thus deception continues to be practiced upon the people, and the present law governing the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine is, instead of benefiting the masses of the people, distinctly and undeniably detrimental to their interests. It is clear that if a retail dealer in oleomargarine sells the article for what it is he can not get the price and the profits he desires. He therefore charges, in nearly all cases, as much for the spurious article as for the genuine. What is known as the Grout bill, as we understand it, places a 10-cent tax on colored oleomargarine.

Very respectfully,

HON. HERMAN B. DAHLE,
Mount Horeb, Wis.

P. H. BOLTEN & CO.

CHICAGO, ILL., December 3, 1900.

DEAR SIR: There is no question but what butterine, or oleomargarine, is sold on this market every day for pure creamery butter; in fact, the writer knows of several places where this is done, and the people that are doing it seem to gloat over the fact that they are able to sell the counterfeit as the genuine. The merchants here, as well as in other sections of the country, we do not think would complain at all if this was not the case. But it is the case, and it is detrimental to the butter interests of the United States, and we certainly favor the Grout bill in every particular, and sincerely trust that you can give it your hearty support and use your influence in gaining friends for the bill. We think it is one of the most important bills that is to come up during this session of Congress. We hope that you can present the merits of this bill so strongly to your friends in Congress that there will be no doubt as to its passage.

Yours, very truly,

HON. HERMAN B. DAHLE, Washington, D. C.

EARL BROS.

ST. LOUIS, MO., November 15, 1900.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the sale of oleomargarine in this city, I have kept close observation for a good many years. I am free to say that the retailer is selling 95 per cent of colored oleomargarine as butter, for he positively could not sell it as oleomargarine, as people do not want it. As a result he is bound to charge butter prices or cut butter prices very slightly in order to undersell the honest dealer who sells pure butter. Pure butter in our market to-day is selling at 23 cents per pound to the consumer. The oleomargarine dealer on Union Market, and scattered throughout the city, offers his goods at 23 to 27 cents per pound, and the consumer is misled by this cut in price and thinks that he is buying the same class of goods as the honest butter dealer sells, only saving 1 or 2 cents per pound on the price. This has been the practice for a good many years. There are hundreds of thousands of pounds sold in this city per month, not only by the retail dealers who keep established stores, but unscrupulous scoundrels, disguised as countrymen and farmers, peddle the same around among the families as pure butter and charge extra prices for it on account of, as they allege, "it being just from the country."

This has had the effect of driving many formerly honest dealers in butter

into the sale of oleomargarine in self-protection, so they may hold their trade for groceries and meats. The violation of the color law in the State of Missouri has become so flagrant that our board of agriculture has practically thrown up its hands in despair, as the oleomargarine dealers, with the protection they receive from the manufacturers (and which protection is guaranteed to them in case they get into trouble), have succeeded in frustrating every attempt to bring these violators of the oleomargarine law to justice. Our State courts are totally incapable of dealing with the subject, and adroit lawyers have so tangled up the judges on the bench that we have no further hope of being able to obtain the slightest relief in that direction; so all that is left to us is that the Grout bill must pass or we will all be obliged to sell oleomargarine, and it will then be only a question of a very short time before pure butter will be one of the things of the past.

I have before me a statement made by George Aldredge, made before the Committee on Agriculture, in which the gentleman tells the story about the "Quaker's prayer when the stars fell," in which the Quaker says, "Oh, Lord! this is to be judgment day, and Thou knoweth that hell won't hold half of us." The said Quaker had possibly been an oleomargarine dealer or some other malefactor. Now, I desire to add to this that there are not penitentiaries enough in this country to hold all of the violators of the oleomargarine law if they could all be reached and convicted. The fact that these violations against the State law are openly committed and that no prosecution has been able to convict one of them as yet is evidence enough that these laws are not effective and must be supplemented by something more strong.

The oleomargarine industry has ruined thousands of thriving farmers who were on the high road to prosperity. I am well satisfied that the farming community would be more than willing to buy out the entire manufacturing plants of the oleomargarine people and throw them into the fire if they could thereby obtain relief, but the source of profit to the manufacturers of oleomargarine has been so great that they will not sell out at any price. The tax as proposed in the Grout bill is no hardship upon anyone, nor will it interfere with the sale of oleomargarine as oleomargarine, but it may possibly interfere with the sale of oleomargarine if offered as butter. On the other hand, the reduction of the tax from 2 cents per pound to one-fourth of a cent per pound will certainly benefit the consumer, who, by the oleomargarine manufacturer, is supposed to be a poor man, which, however, is not always borne out by the fact. Well-to-do people buy it under the impression that they are getting butter.

I hope that the Grout bill will pass, and that it will be very soon. If the present condition of affairs is allowed to continue very much longer, it will drive not only the dairy interest out of business, but all who have so far stood up for purity in food products in the line of butter and cheese.

Should the sale of colored oleomargarine be, by this law, curtailed, it will not raise the price of pure butter but very little, as then the dairy interest of this country will take on such a boom and increase as will prevent any extreme values. Besides, the 10-cent tax does not prevent the sale of colored oleomargarine. It only places pure butter again in competition with an imitation, which it is now not able to assume.

The butter dealers, consumers, and grocers of this city feel under many obligations to yourself and companions for the noble fight you are making in their behalf against the most outrageous fraud produced in the nineteenth century.

Very respectfully,

HON. H. B. DAHLE,
Mount Horeb, Wis.

F. W. BROCKMAN, President.

BALTIMORE, MD., November 30, 1900.

DEAR SIR: Oleomargarine is sold on this market in nearly every case for and as butter. If the sellers of oleomargarine were to offer the stuff under the true name, they would not be able to do any business here. We sincerely trust that you and the other Congressmen favorable to the dairy interests will do all in your power to have the Grout bill passed. If at any time the Baltimore merchants can be of any service, we would be glad to have you call on them.

Very truly, yours,

HON. HERMAN B. DAHLE,
Washington, D. C.

G. M. LAMB & BRO.

NEW YORK, November 15, 1900.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the Grout bill, I think it is one of the best bills that has come before the House, and should be passed. While the bill is not stringent enough, I think it is the best that has been so far offered. Another thing, would say if it was not for the fraudulent sale of oleomargarine this country could consume about all the product of genuine butter, and would not have to depend on the export trade, at least only for a limited amount.

Hoping that you will meet with success in your endeavors, I remain,

Respectfully,

MESSRS. DAHLE BROTHERS,
Mount Horeb, Wis.

CHAS. H. ZINN.

NEW YORK, November 20, 1900.

DEAR SIR: I am satisfied that if the dairy interest of the United States is worth the consideration of Congress (and I think it is, as it is certainly the largest one interest in the country, and more capital involved than any other) the Grout bill should be passed.

It is simply ridiculous to consider the argument that the consuming public buy oleomargarine knowingly. There is no doubt that the retailer buys it knowing what he is doing and for the purpose of selling it to the public for butter. Why? Because there is a much larger profit in it for him, and there would be no incentive for him to violate the State laws if people knew what they were buying and he was only making a reasonable profit.

The passage of this law will immediately stimulate the dairy interests, as it will make an increased demand for butter at better prices, and an increased demand for such means an increased demand for cows and the spreading of the dairy industry in the present dairy States, as well as in other States of the Northwest.

Yours, truly,

HON. H. B. DAHLE, Mount Horeb, Wis.

STEPHEN UNDERHILL,
Per C.

NEW YORK MERCANTILE EXCHANGE,
CORNER HUDSON AND HARRISON STREETS,
New York, December 3, 1900.

At a meeting of the members of the New York Mercantile Exchange, held December 3, it was unanimously resolved that a personal appeal be made to each member of Congress of this State, urging him to support and use his best efforts toward effecting the passage of the "Grout bill," considering it a matter of vital importance to the dairy interests of the country and merchants dealing in pure butter in New York State.

You will be called upon December 6 to decide between two measures—the Grout bill and the Wadsworth bill. Every interest from the producer to the consumer favors the Grout bill.

Very truly, yours,

F. C. BARGER, President,
HOWARD D. REYNOLDS, Secretary.

One of these letters comes from Ash & Baldwin, Pittsburg, Pa., inclosing price list issued by a wholesale firm located in one of their neighboring villages, quoting solid-packed Elgin creamery butter at 3½ cents per pound less than the present value of such butter. The fact is the value of creamery butter is as fixed as the value of gold dollars. If, for instance, Elgin butter to-day is quoted at 25 cents in Chicago and 25½ cents in New York, the idea of offering such goods at 3½ cents a pound less than its market value is as reasonable and at about the same ratio as selling gold dollars at 90 cents.

This circular states that these goods are not made by any creamery interested with a combine and speculators, who are asking for their products on established brands a great and outrageous profit. If these parties are selling genuine fresh creamery butter, they can no longer continue same than they could continue disposing of gold dollars at the price just named; yet these parties claim to have been carrying on their business in butter for the last seven years. Is it any wonder that honest dealers who come into competition with these dishonest firms want all the protection they can get?

When I read this circular claiming that its product is not made by a creamery interested with a combine and speculators, who to-day are asking for their product on established brands a great and outrageous profit, it reminds me of the fact that millions of farmers to a great extent themselves are proprietors and owners of creameries, and those creameries that are not run by the farmers themselves are owned and operated by private individuals or partnerships. I am informed by our National Dairy Union that by far the greater part are owned by the farmers themselves, who are not in position to form a trust or combine if they wanted to. Of all classes of producers of our Union I regard the farmer the hardest for us to protect.

NEW YORK.

DEAR SIR: Referring to ours of yesterday, we forgot to mention one point that we had in our mind to make, and that is the great interest the manufacturers of oleomargarine have exhibited in furnishing a cheap butter for the poorer people. They make a great handle of this, but as a matter of fact—and nobody knows it better than they do themselves—oleomargarine is sold invariably to the poor man for butter and at butter prices. Every man who handles it or handles butter knows this to be a fact, and furthermore, that it can not be sold even to the poor man unless it is sold and represented as butter. It is well understood that the production of oleomargarine is almost entirely in Chicago, and by the large packing houses.

No doubt there are large profits in the business, and these people have never lacked for money to spend to protect themselves. They are men of large influence, and naturally they may control the Senators and Members of the House from Illinois. While the manufacturers claim it to be an honest business and that they sell it for what it is, they know as well as anybody that it can only be sold to the consumer as butter—not at the price of cheap butter, either, but at butter price. If they offered it to the poor man at a cheap price, it would create a suspicion in his mind. The class of people that they impose on are the poor and ignorant—a class of all others that ought to be dealt with honestly and have the best value for their money. If the poor man wanted oleomargarine he ought to have it at a fair value and at a fair profit; but, as every dealer knows, it is no object to sell it unless he can make a greater profit than he can make in selling butter, and the only inducement for the retailer to handle it and palm it off on his poor and ignorant customers is the fact that he can get three or four times as much profit out of it as he can out of butter.

Nobody knows this better than the parties who manufacture it, and that unless the retailer can get three or four profits out of it he would not handle it. It is very well understood that the manufacturers encourage this business, and have even guaranteed to protect the retailers in case suits were brought against them. In our judgment the men who are manufacturing the stuff, even if they do sell it for what it is, are no more honest than the man who retails it to the consumer as butter and at a butter price. The manufacturer knows perfectly well that the retailer is going to do this when he buys it. No doubt the oleomargarine interests will make a strong fight against this bill in the Senate, and, as we have said, they have lots of money to spend and no doubt control more or less influence; but we sincerely hope that the Grout bill will go through. If there ever was a righteous measure before Congress, this is one of them.

This letter has been dictated by our senior, who has had more or less to do with all previous legislation on the subject in our own State, as well as the previous legislation by Congress.

Very truly, yours,

HON. HERMAN B. DAHLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

J. S. MARTIN & CO.

I will now quote from the discussion which took place in our committee room, when Mr. John C. McCoy, of the Kansas City Live Stock Exchange, appeared before our committee. In the course of the remarks Representative BAILEY gave us his experience in the market place of our city of Washington as to the oleomargarine and butter trade. This is what he said:

Representative BAILEY. Let me give a little personal experience on that subject. I have spent parts of two days in this market here. I have made two trips down through it for the purpose of getting information on that very point. I went down there absolutely incognito; and I tried my best to buy oleomargarine for butter. I went to this place and to that, and did my best to do it, without their knowing a thing about it—

Representative LAMB. What did you ask for?

Representative BAILEY. I asked for butter. I would say, "What do you sell your best creamery butter for?" "Thirty-five and 40 cents." "What have you got some other grade for?" They would say that they had a cheaper

grade down to 23 cents, and I think the lowest butter I saw or had priced to me was 25 cents. When it got below that it was oleomargarine or butterine every time.

Now, I was unable in that market to buy a single pound of it, and I could not get a single man to admit to me down there that it was sold—not a single man. Now, I want you to go down there, Mr. LAMB. I will tell you what I will do. I will bet you a five-dollar bill that, if you choose to try it, you can not get one of those men to sell oleomargarine to you for butter.

After hearing this discussion I concluded also to investigate as to what was going on in that market. I partook of a meal in the restaurant of this market place and took a sample of what was served there as butter. I had the same analyzed in the chemical department of our Department of Agriculture, and, would you believe it, it was not butter, but oleomargarine.

So it appears to me from the testimony I have here quoted, not alone from the most prominent dairymen all over the land, but from the unwilling testimony of the oleomargarine manufacturers themselves, we have gleaned the facts that not alone is oleomargarine sold for that which it is not—butter—but that it is sold also in violation of existing laws.

Before leaving this question entirely let me here introduce the testimony of Mr. Fred. Oliver, representing the cotton-seed oil interests of North and South Carolina, and then let us briefly consider his speech and his answers given to questions concerning this question before us. He claims that the bills introduced to legislate the manufacture of oleomargarine are always originated and introduced by a special class of the country's population, the dairy farmers (the manufacturers of dairy butter); not as a unit, however, for there are many honorable, conscientious, justice-loving dairy farmers who do not approve of such class legislation.

Gentlemen, as I have stated before, I can not see how this can be class legislation. It is simply our aim to pass some laws protecting producer and consumer alike, and the most urgent appeals for the passage of this law come from the manufacturers of our best creamery butter and consumers, who wish to know that they are getting butter when they demand same, from all over the land. If Mr. Oliver is a fair representative of South Carolina, then I must say that that State is certainly way behind the times in understanding the situation as to who are now looking for the passage of some law that will better protect the manufacturers of pure butter from the competition of a substitute illegally sold. This party claims that it is only the producers of low-grade butter, who find their wares shelved, who are always agitating the taxing of oleomargarine, making its sale prohibitory.

I have been a dealer in butter since before oleomargarine was invented, and my experience is that there never was a time when low-grade butter fared as well as it now does by reason of the invention now made use of by which all such goods are made over into what is now known as process butter. I certainly do not agree with this gentleman when he claims that large quantities of adulterated butter or oleomargarine is made by the small country butter makers in every State of the Union, as he has it, wherever there is a smart Aleck of a farmer that can make butterine, and any man can make it.

Gentlemen, I have lived amongst farmers all my life, amongst producers of butter. The production of this article is one of the leading branches of industry in my district, if not the leading one, and although a dealer in this product since childhood, and my father before me, never but once did either of us find any adulteration. When I was a small boy an old lady brought a few small rolls of butter to my father's store. He cut one roll open and inside of same found a dirty mixture of lard, tallow, or some such material. This woman immediately wrapped her goods up and was ready to start home with same, after my father admonished her of her criminal deed, which he told her he, least of all, expected from an old woman walking the brink of the grave.

When this gentleman speaks of the manufacturers of oleomargarine submitting to all the vexatious regulations necessary to sell the same—and this he mentions after telling us about the small farmers who can produce oleomargarine, selling same as homemade, pure country butter without tax or restriction, and that this is the class of dairymen and producers of dirty, unscientifically made, pure butter asking for tax and sale restrictions on oleomargarine—gentlemen, I am pleased to know with myself and to feel that the great majority of you, my fellow-members, feel and know that just the opposite of what this gentleman claims is the true situation. The small farmer is the innocent one, and the vexatious regulations that he speaks of are those that the manufacturer of colored oleomargarine and their agents meet when they go to dispose of their product in the very many States that have passed laws against the sale of such product.

We also find that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue informed our committee that the law regarding payment of the 2-cent tax on oleomargarine is better complied with than taxes on other commodities.

We find that Mr. Oliver predicts that if any one of the proposed 10 cents per pound tax or anti-coloring bills be enacted it will prohibit the open manufacture of oleomargarine, but that an increased number of farmers and moonshine manufacturers, in

defiance of the laws and without paying taxes, will then spring up. In answer to this I would say that I have no doubt but what the very rapid growth that there has been to the oleomargarine industry will be checked, and we want the illegitimate sale of it checked.

I do not, however, believe in the great increase in the manufacture of homemade oleomargarine in the future, any more than I believe it has taken place in the past. In answer to this, Internal-Revenue Commissioner Wilson says:

I do not think we can have "moonshine" oleo. There has never been any evasion of the law with respect to paying the tax on oleomargarine, except in a very incidental and limited way. Neither the special tax (although it is high) nor the 2-cent pound tax have ever been evaded. We have no trouble in collecting them.

Our farmers will never become as skillful in evading these laws as this gentleman's people—that is, the people of North and South Carolina—are in evading the liquor laws. He further states, We earnestly protest against the passage of the proposed bills as being unnecessary and very harmful to our business, to the country's business at large, and to the morals of many farmers and others. It will be a temptation that a great many present law-abiding farmers will not be able to resist, and they will become the same as a great many western North Carolina moonshiners for the manufacture of oleomargarine.

Gentlemen, again let me state that I feel that the reason we have to pass the Grout bill or some similar bill is simply because the manufacturers and dealers in oleomargarine are not living up to the present law, and I feel that the nature of these different classes of producers are apt to be the same in the future as in the past, and that is that the producer of butter is the one who is now living up to the present laws, and that the transgressor is the manufacturer and vender of oleomargarine. This speaker claims that he at one time, seventeen years ago, knew a man near Paterson, N. J., who lived in the country and made oleomargarine on a very small scale; that seems to be all the evidence that this gentleman can produce.

WHO ARE ASKING FOR THE PASSAGE OF THE GROUT BILL AND WHY IT SHOULD PASS.

On this subject, as to who is asking for the passage of the Grout bill, we will consider the speech of Mr. George N. Aldredge, representing Oil Mill Association, of the State of Texas, delivered before our committee. He starts out by stating that it is not the best butter makers that are in the fight against oleomargarine, that they do not compete with the Elgin people, and that the Elgin people do not complain of the oleomargarine manufacturer, claiming that there are rich people all over the country who are going to have butter and pay for it, and that oleomargarine is not in competition with this class of butter, but that it is the low grades that come in competition with oleomargarine, and that the people handling the same are the ones who are complaining to-day; that the best butter makers of this country are not in this fight against oleomargarine, but it is the men that want to offend the nostrils and vitiate the taste and poison the stomachs of men with inferior butter that are clamoring here before Congress to shut out a perfectly pure, clean product with which they find they can not compete; that is the situation as he claims it.

Mr. Speaker and fellow-members, let me assure you that this man from Texas is entirely mistaken as to who are in the fight against oleomargarine. In the place of such parties as he mentions we have had Mr. H. C. Adams, the dairy and food commissioner of our State, spending much time with our committee trying to get a favorable report from same on this bill. As I previously stated, there are 250 or more separator creameries in my district, and I have heard from nearly all of the proprietors or managers and from hundreds, yes, thousands, of patrons of these creameries and consumers who wish pure butter, all asking that we pass this bill, and I learn from other members of our committee that they have had the same experience; not alone members of our committee, but all members from butter-producing districts and from such places where the consumer wants to know that he is receiving the pure article when he pays for the same.

I understand that there are concerns in the United States dealing in low-grade butter, making same over into what is called "process butter." Mr. Aldredge informs us that these dealers in such low-grade butter are the ones complaining, but let me assure you that as a member of Congress or as a member of the Committee on Agriculture I have not, that I know of, received a single complaint from any one of such parties.

We find this party claims that there are rich people all over the country who are going to have butter and are willing to pay for it, and that oleomargarine is not in competition with the class of butter they buy. Gentlemen, there are people all over the country who want to buy pure butter and are willing to pay for it. Under the present conditions the profit to the party who sells oleomargarine for butter is so large and the temptation is so strong that we find it is true that dealers do fall, and it is for the protection of such parties, who want the genuine article, we should pass

the Grout bill. Oleomargarine is in competition with this class of butter—in fact, is more in competition with this class than it is with the lower class.

He further states that butter is higher than it was forty, twenty, or ten years ago, and that the producers can not supply the demand; that New York is short of butter all the time. In another place in my speech I introduce figures showing the market on butter many years past, proving the error of this statement. The gentleman is also mistaken when he states that New York is short all the time. I happen to have some butter myself that I would like to dispose of, so that I would be very glad if the gentleman was correct in his assertion; but to my sorrow I find he is not. He further claims that these dairymen are already immune from smallpox, and they ask the Government to give them immunity against competition. This, you can all see, is not so when we reduce the tax on the uncolored to one-fourth of a cent a pound.

He further states that we come before you claiming that 32 States have adopted this butter law, and that it has not had any effect. "They can not stop it. Why is that? Can Congress do more? Why is it they can not stop it? I will tell you," he says. "The world has never yet found anything that it wanted that it did not get in some way. No man can throttle a world's wants. The world has tried oleomargarine, etc. It is just what they want, and all legislation on earth can not prevent their getting it." Taking the speaker at his words, there is but one thing to do and do justice to everybody, and that is to impose the extra 8 cents a pound tax on the colored oleomargarine, so that the price of this product will come up nearly to the average price of the best creamery butter, so that the consumer can have his choice at about the same price.

The gentleman further states:

We will have to regulate the ladies. Why, they use paint, they use powder. One of them steps out of her home into the street or to the parlor, and she has these yellow ribbons on. That is the thing that makes these dairy people so awful hot, and her shape is perfection. Visions of the Greek Slave and all lovely statuary rise before you as she ambles down the street; she is perfection. And yet they are not all built that way. Some of them are fearfully and wonderfully made. Now, the Government ought to take a hand in that and stop that kind of deception which they practice on us men.

Why, sir, the wearing of clothes is a deception and disguises a man's deformities. Congress must step in and make every fellow go naked and grow hair like a hog. That is the way to be natural. Now, gentlemen, the fact is that if the Government is going to regulate all the domestic affairs and poke its nose into butter and everything else, then the Government has to quit everything else. Why, sir, a lot of people would like to put this Government to grinding coffee and toting out slops. That is their idea of government; that is their idea of what government is, for what business has the Government fooling around here in butter.

In answer to the above, let me here express my opinion as to what I feel that my duty is, and I must say that I judge that my duties are entirely different from the ideas of this speaker. I do not believe in the Government trying to regulate domestic affairs, but I certainly do believe that our Government must poke its nose, as the speaker has it, into butter, and I would feel ashamed to go home and meet my constituents, whether producer or consumer, if I had not done this very thing. I just read from this gentleman's speech where he asks, What business has the Government fooling around here in butter? Gentlemen, we are simply compelled to, when we find, as stated by this gentleman, that in 32 of our States, in which over three-fourths of all the oleomargarine manufactured in our country is sold, it is sold against State laws. Therefore these people come to us for help, and it is our duty to help them by passing this measure.

INVESTMENTS OF OLEOMARGARINE FACTORIES AND CREAMERIES, AND LOSSES SUSTAINED SHOULD THIS BILL BECOME A LAW.

Statement of W. E. Miller, esq., representing Armour & Co., Kansas City, Kans.:

GENTLEMEN: The passage of a law such as the Grout bill would destroy an industry in which there are \$15,000,000 invested and 25,000 men employed. It would deprive the Government of over \$2,000,000 annually, and practically destroy the cotton-seed oil industry of the South, in which there are millions of dollars invested and many thousands of men employed.

The injury to the cattle and hog industry is almost beyond estimate, although it has been conservatively stated that the depreciation would be \$62,000,000 annually.

Representative HAUGEN. What is the number of pounds or gallons of cotton-seed oil used in the oleomargarine output?

Mr. MILLER. How much do we use, do you mean?

Representative HAUGEN. What is the amount used in the aggregate by all the factories?

Mr. MILLER. I think it is in the neighborhood of 10,000,000 pounds.

Representative HAUGEN. Per annum?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; for the reason that if they could not use these 10,000,000 pounds of the refined oil in the manufacture of butterine, they would have to sell it in its crude state, and it would place a ban upon what little export business they had and kill that; therefore it would practically ruin the industry.

Representative HAUGEN. You state, then, that you have no knowledge of the number of gallons or the number of pounds of cotton-seed oil produced in this country?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Representative HAUGEN. And yet you make the statement that this bill would destroy the cotton-seed industry of the South?

Mr. MILLER. I make the statement as I got it from the cotton-seed oil people.

Statement of John C. McCoy, Kansas City Live Stock Exchange:

This bill is aimed at the life of a great commercial industry, that of oleomargarine. We believe it will, if enacted into a law, seriously cripple one by comparison with which both oleomargarine and that of its opponent, butter, pale into significance. I refer to the live-stock industry. The Government reports show that on January 1, 1900, there were in the United States 43,902,414 head of cattle. By the enactment of laws prohibiting the use of oleomargarine each head of those cattle other than milch cows would have a depreciation in value, as shown above, of \$2 per head, or a total of \$87,804,828. If the leaf lard of the hogs of the United States had to be used for lard by the death of oleomargarine, it would mean a depreciation in value of 20 cents per head, a total of \$7,780,326. Thus it will be seen if these measures become laws, at that instant \$95,585,154 will be taken directly from the farmers and stock raisers of the country.

Representative DAHLE. Mr. McCoy, do you make any allowance for the amount of oleo oil that is exported or that may be exported in calculating as you do the loss to the farmers in case this bill should be passed? As I understand only a small part of the oleo oil which is made in this country is used here and the largest part is exported, I can not see where you make such allowance. Do you?

Mr. MCCOY. No, sir.

Representative DAHLE. Would it not be fair to make such an allowance, knowing, as we do, that by far the larger part is exported? Is not that the case?

Mr. MCCOY. That is my understanding, that the larger percentage of the manufactured oleo product is exported.

Representative STOKES. Without attempting or anticipating the gentleman's answer, I would like to supplement the question by this inquiry: Is it not a fact, which is generally recognized with regard to all export commodities, that the price of the exported part is really the part affected in determining local prices?

Mr. MCCOY. As a general rule that is the case. This seems because it is the only way of getting rid of our surplus. I can not tell except from a statement I have seen. I may be wrong in my recollection of it, but I think I saw it stated that 132,000,000 pounds were exported in 1898.

Representative DAHLE. If 83,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine were manufactured in that year, then only a small fraction of the total amount of oleo oil made was used here at home.

Mr. MCCOY. Exactly.

W. R. Cantrell, secretary of the Williams & Flash Company, New York City, exporters and commission merchants of cotton-seed oil products, stated:

The exports in 1899 were 50,627,213 gallons, or 1,021,514 barrels, which amount, taken at the average price of that year, represents a value in dollars and cents of \$13,163,076.94. If the outlet we now possess in oleomargarine is destroyed and a surplus thus created, it would cause the decline in value of at least \$2 per barrel, which, taken at last year's production of 2,000,000 barrels, means a loss to the farming interests of the South and Southwest of \$4,000,000.

The following is another statement of Mr. Lavery:

Representative COONEY. This is what I want to get at. Mr. Lavery, you state that a slaughtered steer will contain about 50 pounds of this fat out of which you make oleo oil?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes, sir.

Representative HAUGEN. I would like to continue the question which has been asked you. You claim that the manufacture of this product makes \$2 per head of difference on cattle?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes, sir.

Representative HAUGEN. On what ground do you base your claim? What is the number of cattle slaughtered, according to the Government reports or estimate which you have?

Mr. LAVERY. In the United States?

Representative HAUGEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAVERY. I have not those figures at hand.

Representative HAUGEN. I think it is about 5,000,000 head, is it not? According to the Agricultural Department report it is 4,654,000. According to the reports there were 24,491,760 pounds of this oleo oil consumed.

Mr. LAVERY. Yes, sir; here in this country.

Representative HAUGEN. In manufacture?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes, sir.

Representative HAUGEN. That would amount to less than five pounds to each head of cattle, would it not?

Mr. LAVERY. Well, you understand that, as I stated a while ago—

Representative HAUGEN. I am referring now to whatever this bill refers to. It has nothing to do with the oleomargarine shipped abroad. This bill does not affect the exports. It refers to what is consumed here at home or what is colored. Now, this would amount to less than 5 pounds to a head, would it not?

Mr. LAVERY. I have not figured that out.

Representative HAUGEN. Well, it is necessary, in view of the statements and assertions that you have made, to figure it out in dollars and cents and in pounds.

Mr. LAVERY. Yes, sir.

Representative HAUGEN. Now, then, if there are 24,000,000 pounds used or consumed and 5,000,000 head of cattle slaughtered, that is less than 5 pounds to each head of cattle killed.

Mr. LAVERY. Yes, sir.

Representative HAUGEN. You stated a while ago that there was a difference of 4 cents a pound between the prices paid for this fat for the purposes of tallow and oleo oil; now, then, 5 pounds of fat at 4 cents a pound is 20 cents, or less than 20 cents, for each head of cattle killed, according to your own statement, is it not?

Mr. LAVERY. Well, taking only the amount of oil consumed in this country it would probably be that much less than \$2; I consider that this bill would affect more than our own country.

Representative HAUGEN. We will come to that later, but I wish to make this point clear.

Mr. LAVERY. It would be much less than \$2 on that basis.

Representative HAUGEN. Are my statements correct, then?

Mr. LAVERY. It is simply a question of figures; I have not figured it out. Representative HAUGEN. It is necessary to use figures to arrive at the result.

Mr. LAVERY. That is simply a question of figures.

Representative HAUGEN. You claim that the 10-cent tax would practically kill your industry?

Mr. LAVERY. I certainly do; yes, sir.

Representative HAUGEN. What is oleomargarine worth to-day uncolored? What is the average price for the year?

Mr. LAVERY. The average price to-day is, say, 11 to 14 cents wholesale; there is no difference between the cost of the colored and the uncolored product.

I now read from communication of Cattle Raisers' Association, presented by Mr. S. H. Cowan, of Fort Worth, Tex.:

The enactment of such laws would completely destroy a business which has been recognized by law, which now furnishes a large revenue to the Government (\$1,956,618 in A. D. 1899), which provides employment for thousands of men, and in which citizens of the United States have invested fortunes. It would seriously affect the cattle industry, as the manufacturers of oleomargarine have created a demand for oleo oil made from the choice fats from the beef at a price at least \$3 per animal greater than it would be worth if it had to be used, as before the advent of oleomargarine, for tallow, thereby entailing a loss on the producers of millions of dollars annually. No law can make more stringent requirements to protect consumers than those now in force, and the fact that the output is yearly increasing shows that there is a demand for oleomargarine as such in spite of all hostile agitation and legislation.

THE CATTLE RAISERS' ASSOCIATION OF TEXAS.

I will now read from resolution presented by Mr. Cowan, passed by Cattle Raisers' Association of Missouri:

The butter fat of an average beef animal for the purpose of making oleomargarine is worth from \$3 to \$4 per head more than it was before the advent of oleomargarine, when the same had to be used for tallow, which increased value of the beef steer has been added to the market value of the animal, and consequently to the profit of the producer. To legislate this article of commerce out of existence, as the passage of this law would surely do, would compel slaughterers to use their fat for tallow, depreciate the value of the beef steer of this country \$3 to \$4 per head, which would entail a loss on the producers of this country of millions of dollars.

THE SOUTH ST. JOSEPH LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE.

Statement of J. A. Hake, president of Live Stock Exchange, South Omaha, Nebr.:

The probable loss to the beef producers of this country, should this measure (the Grant bill) become a law, has been estimated by different persons to be about one hundred millions, to say nothing of the confiscation of about fifteen millions invested in the manufacture of oleomargarine and butterine, and the loss of employment to about 25,000 men.

Mr. Speaker, we find in the statement of Mr. Miller that he claims investment of \$15,000,000 by the oleomargarine manufacturers. Permit me here to give you the result of my investigation as to the correctness of that statement. The following is a list of the oleomargarine factories of the United States. They are 26 in number, as follows:

Name.	City and State.
Oakdale Mfg. Co.	Providence, R. I.
Vermont Mfg. Co.	Do.
Goshen Mfg. Co.	Do.
Friedman Mfg. Co.	Chicago, Ill.
Swift & Co.	Do.
Wm. J. Moxley.	Do.
Braun & Fitts.	Do.
International Pkg. Co.	Do.
Chicago Butterine Mfg. Co.	Do.
Arthur Jordan Co.	Indianapolis, Ind.
Kingman & Co.	Do.
The G. H. Hammond Co.	Hammont, Ind.
Armour Pkg. Co., W. A. Miller.	Kansas City, Kans.
Swift & Co., C. M. Labrey.	Do.
Harrison Butterine Co.	Do.
Falls City Dairy Co.	Louisville, Ky.
The National Dairy Co.	Washington, D. C.
R. C. Dotson.	Do.
Dold Butterine Co.	Kansas City, Mo.
Grovedale Co.	Camden, N. J.
The Gillette Butterine Co.	Jersey City, N. J.
The Capital City Dairy Co.	Columbus, Ohio.
The Union Dairy Co.	Cleveland, Ohio.
Holland Butterine Co.	Pittsburg, Pa.
Henke & Pillot.	Houston, Tex.
Illinois Dairy Co.	East St. Louis, Ill.

So that the average investment in each one of these factories would amount to about \$500,000, or near \$600,000.

Amongst the parties that appeared before us was Mr. G. M. Waldron, director Kansas City Live Stock Exchange, who said:

You gentlemen are all busy men. I take it that you are very much interested in this problem before you. Would it not be wise for you as business men to understand the subject from personal observation? What I mean by personal observation is to go to the centers of this great industry and investigate its methods, its manufacture, etc. My purpose simply is to invite this committee as a whole, or a subcommittee that you may appoint, to go to these great centers of this manufacturing interest—Chicago, St. Louis, Kansas City, and other points in your country—and go through the institutions and learn about the manufacture of this product.

As advised by him, I went and saw R. C. Dotson's oleomargarine factory, this city, and after having seen what an insignificant thing this firm is I concluded to further investigate as to the value of other plants, machinery, fixtures, etc., through our mercantile agencies, through which all business houses find out as to the financial and other standing of their customers when they ask credit. In the place of each concern having an investment of \$500,000 or more I found the following concerns quoted as follows:

The Fall City Dairy Company, Louisville, Ky., stock, fixtures, and machinery, is rated as worth \$3,000.

Capital City Dairy Company, Columbus, Ohio, incorporated for \$30,000.

Purity Butterine Manufacturing Company, Chicago, machinery and fixtures, \$1,500.

Illinois Dairy Company, East St. Louis, Ill., company's investment, \$5,000.

Union Dairy Company, Cleveland, Ohio, authorized capital, \$50,000.

Goshen Manufacturing Company, Providence, R. I., incorporated for \$25,000.

Vermont Manufacturing Company, Providence, R. I., machinery and buildings, \$43,000.

Gillette Butterine Company, Jersey City, N. J., plant, machinery, and stock, \$2,500.

Elgin Butter Company, Indianapolis, Ind., machinery, factories, and teams, \$3,000.

R. C. Dotson, Washington, D. C., machinery, \$3,775.

Holland Butterine Company, Pittsburg, Pa., plants, machinery, etc., \$60,000.

W. J. Moxley, Chicago, according to last statement given by their bookkeeper, plants, factories, and machinery, \$30,850.63.

In the place of these 12 concerns being worth \$6,000,000 or nearly \$7,000,000, I find that all their machinery, factories, etc., is worth \$257,628, or what is less than 5 per cent of what is claimed as their investment. In contrast to this I find that there are 252 creameries in my district of Wisconsin, according to report of our dairy and food commissioner, worth on an average \$2,700, making a total value of \$680,000, while in the State of Wisconsin there are 951 creameries, worth, at same valuation, \$2,567,700. When we compare these figures with the figures of oleomargarine concerns just read, then you can readily see the insignificant sum invested in the imitation business as compared with the legitimate industry.

We find that Mr. Miller, in speaking of the losses sustained by the passage of this bill, claims the practical destruction of the cotton-seed oil industry with its millions invested and thousands employed, injury to the cattle and hog industry beyond estimate, depreciation \$62,000,000 annually. Mr. McCoy claims the depreciation in value of live stock of \$2 a head or \$55,220,108; loss on hogs, 20 cents a head, amounting to \$7,730,326. The instant this measure becomes a law \$62,950,434 will be taken directly from the farmers and stock raisers of the country.

Mr. Cantrell, of New York, claims a decline in the value of cotton-seed oil of at least \$2 a barrel, making a loss to the farming interests of \$4,000,000 on that product. Mr. Lavery claims a difference of \$2 per head on cattle, making a loss on cattle, according to Agricultural Department, as stated by Mr. HAUGEN, of between nine or ten million dollars. Mr. Cowan, of Fort Worth, Tex., claims the loss of millions of dollars annually. Mr. Hake, president of the Live Stock Exchange of South Omaha, however, takes the cake in his statement, the probable loss to the beef producers estimated at one hundred millions, besides confiscation of about fifteen millions invested in the manufacture of oleomargarine.

We will now briefly consider the stupendous amounts claimed by these parties. We agree that there was 83,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine manufactured last year. We will figure this to cost 8 cents a pound, that is, without internal revenue added. This figure I know to be high, but I wish to be on the safe side so that my opponents can not claim of me such tremendous exaggeration as they have used in their statements touching on all points at issue. Now, we find that 83,000,000 pounds at 8 cents a pound amounts to \$6,640,000; so that, if the oleomargarine factories had been closed down December 31, 1898, and that the material that it took to produce this oleomargarine had been left on the hands of its producers and that they could not have realized one solitary dollar from its sale for the year 1899, then the total loss would only have been \$6,640,000 in place of the sixty or more millions that these parties named.

The above amount, \$6,640,000, stands not only for the material itself that it took to make this oleomargarine, but also for the work of manufacturing same, so that in getting at the loss, if any there be, to the producers of the materials that goes into the oleomargarine manufactured, we must subtract from above amount all that the packing houses could realize out of the lard and tallow that they furnished, and the cotton-seed oil mills the cotton-seed oil they furnished. As to the two products furnished by the packers, when we think it over carefully and in a business-like way, how very small this difference in price could be as to the latter.

I understand that the amount of cotton-seed oil used in oleomargarine is from 10 to 15 per cent, so that the total amount used last year was from eight to twelve million pounds. We find that Mr. Cantrell, of New York, advised us that the cotton-seed oil exports in 1899 were 50,000,000 gallons, so that the eight to twelve million pounds consumed is equal to 2 or 3 per cent of the amount exported. Now any business man realizes that such an insignificant percentage as this can not cut any large figure in price of same. I can not spend much further time talking on these figures, but you will notice from the statements that I have read from these parties that appeared before us how the figures dwindle down, like, for instance, Mr. Lavery's figures when Representative

HAUGEN got after him, and they got the figures on the \$2 difference on cattle claimed by Mr. Lavery down to 20 cents a head. I only wish that my effort along this line may have helped to make it clear to my opponents that the Grout bill is all right and ought to be passed.

HEALTHFULNESS AND DIGESTIBILITY.

As to the healthfulness and digestibility of these two products, I have been taught and do believe that the product of milk is easier and more quickly digested than any mixture of lard, tallow, oleo oil, etc. Especially was I strengthened in this faith at one time when I went to the Battle Creek Sanitarium, Battle Creek, Mich., especially on account of my digestive organs. My study there was to learn as much as possible as to what articles of food should be eaten and what should not be eaten; that is, to find out which foods are digested the quickest and easiest.

Their mode of procedure was to have us eat certain articles of food to ascertain whether we could digest them or not. Then they would apply a stomach pump and pump it out again after proper time had elapsed. In this way they ascertained what particular foods each one of us should make use of, and the doctors at this sanitarium, every one of them, very strongly commended butter over any substitute, and always served it. I have not heard anyone present any way of deciding as to the digestibility of these articles that seems so effective to me as the above way.

Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, Chief Chemist, Department of Agriculture, appeared before our committee last winter. His opinion is that butter requires less effort to digest than oleomargarine.

Dr. WILEY. This is exactly what I said in my testimony before the Senate committee. They asked me if I thought oleomargarine was as digestible as butter. I do not think so. I do not think it digests as well as butter because it contains more of the higher series of acids and practically none of the lower series, which are more easily decomposed under the influence of ferments.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. You would say, then, that butter is more quickly digested than oleomargarine?

Dr. WILEY. I believe it is more easily digested; that it requires less effort.

The CHAIRMAN. You think that is the reasonable inference?

Dr. WILEY. From a chemical study of the composition of butter, it is reasonable to infer that it requires less effort on the part of the vital organs to ferment the butter, and that is the reason why I say that I believe butter is a more digestible substance, more easily digested, more quickly digested, than oleomargarine.

I will also quote from a speech delivered before our committee last winter by our ex-governor, W. D. Hoard, president of the National Dairy Union, who has spent a great deal of time and money investigating this question. He says:

There are reports in great abundance to the effect that oleomargarine is harmful.

The friends of oleomargarine generally find satisfaction in the following statements made by the different professors. I will quote Prof. S. C. Caldwell, of Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.:

While not equal to fine butter in respect to flavor, it nevertheless contains all the essential ingredients of butter.

The situation is that the friends of pure butter do not find any fault with oleomargarine on account of its taste.

I brought with me here to Washington five samples of something that I did not know whether it was butter or oleomargarine. One day I met our State dairy commissioner, Mr. H. C. Adams, and Mr. F. J. H. Kracke, assistant dairy commissioner of New York. I asked these gentlemen to examine these samples and inform me which was butter and which was oleo. They looked and smelled and tasted and disagreed, and finally gave it up, stating that they were not sure what they were without having the same analyzed.

Now, then, when we find that our dairy commissioners can not judge, then I conclude the professor has not helped the oleo industry by making the above statement.

Prof. Charles P. Williams, professor in the Missouri State University, says:

It is a pure and wholesome article of food, and in this respect, as well as in respect to its chemical composition, fully the equivalent of the best quality of dairy butter.

This professor compares it with best dairy butter. Now, if he had meant that it was as pure and equivalent to creamery, which is the grade of the great bulk of butter nowadays, I judge he would have said so, and not said dairy butter.

Go down town here and investigate and you will find, as I did, that dairy butter is a thing of the past. In my district, away West in Wisconsin, where we do not have many Yankees, but have Germans, Norwegians, and Irish tilling the soil and milking the cows, not even these foreigners and their descendants make dairy butter. We have 250 creameries in that district alone and over 900 creameries in our State. I can not imagine that we produce 1 per cent of dairy to what we do of creamery.

Prof. C. A. Goessmann, of Amherst Agricultural College, says:

Oleomargarine butter compares in general appearance and in taste very favorably with the average quality of the better kinds of dairy butter in our markets. In its composition it resembles that of ordinary dairy butter, and in its keeping quality, under corresponding circumstances, I believe it will surpass the former, for it contains a smaller percentage of those constituents which, in the main, cause the well-known rancid taste and odor of a stored butter.

We find the Professor starts out by comparing oleomargarine butter with better grades of dairy butter. When he speaks of oleomargarine butter it puts me in mind of the man who spoke of cast-steel steel. In composition he states it resembles. I would expect him to state that in looks it might resemble, while in composition it compares with butter. I judge this professor does not wish to compare it with our best butter, viz, creamery. If he would so have wished, he had done so.

Prof. Henry E. Alvord, formerly of the Massachusetts Agricultural College and president of the Maryland College of Agriculture and now chief of the dairy division of the United States Department of Agriculture, says:

The great bulk of butterine and its kindred products is as wholesome, cleaner, and in many respects better than the low grades of butter, of which so much reaches the market.

What does this professor mean when he speaks of oleomargarine and its kindred products? I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture, as before stated, and I have not there heard about kindred products. Can it be that this professor made a guess that there are some such products and wishes to include them? He then goes on, stating that oleomargarine and its kindred products are as wholesome, cleaner, and in many respects better than the low grades of butter, of which so much reaches the market.

Why does he not compare with the staple creamery butter, and not the low grades which he speaks of? We must conclude that he does not wish to compare the products he names with the butter of to-day, and I do not blame him. Probably it was the wisest thing to say, as he did, low grades of butter.

The one subject brought up before our committee was that of cleanliness. On this subject Mr. Dadie, of W. J. Moxley, Chicago, stated:

We have heretofore refrained from attacking butter and the methods of its manufacture.

And then goes on quoting a letter from Mr. Edward Chadwick, manager of a large creamery at Osgood, Iowa, published in the Chicago Dairy Produce:

A good deal of milk is brought in dirty, because not strained at home and no effort made to keep straws or filth out of it. Some of the cans are seldom or never properly washed, and a thick coating of sticky filth may be scraped off them, both inside and out. I can strain the milk, run it through the separator, and remove a large part of the dirt, but no butter maker on earth can remove the tainted and filthy smell that milk gets from staying in unclean cans in bad-smelling barns.

Some of our patrons would be horrified if they saw the dirt and filth I remove from my strainer and separator. Does anybody think that a bar of soap or chunk of stable manure, potatoes, parsnips, dish rags, or hair pins soaking in your cans over night or longer will improve the flavor of the milk? I have found all of the above, and more, in the strainer of the weigh can. How can good butter be made from such milk? When you send your jar to the creamery for butter for your own use, what would you say if I should put some of the dirt I find in your milk on top of the butter in your jar? You would return that butter to the creamery and be mad besides. If the butter maker would return your dirty milk to your home he would be doing his duty, although it would make you mad.

I agree with Mr. Chadwick that some of his patrons would be horrified to see the dirt and filth he removes from his strainer and separator. I would judge that anyone, proceeding the way he does and continued in the same place long enough, might find the things he claims he has found. I operated one of the first separator creameries in my county. It has happened that we have received sour milk, which condition is generally brought about by carelessness and uncleanness. I instruct my creamery man to be very careful to refuse such milk, and the farmer does not need to have his milk refused many times before he knows as well as the creamery man that he must practice cleanliness, and so the farmer learns, if he does not know it or practice it beforehand, that care and cleanliness are essential to success, and the creamery man who does not practice and teach the same to his patrons is wholly unfit for such position.

COLORING OF BUTTER AND OLEOMARGARINE.

On this subject Mr. W. E. Miller, representing Armour & Co., said:

The first butterine manufactured was of very high color, while butter at that time was almost universally sold in its natural state. The dairymen were quick to see that the high color pleased the public, and they immediately commenced to color their product also. As regards the much-discussed question of color, I would say that we use exactly the same as that sold to a majority of all the creameries in the West, and in about the same proportion. In order to sell our product we must color it now the same as we did when we commenced its manufacture. If we had started out using no coloring whatever, we would doubtless have had as large a business established on uncolored to-day as we have on colored butterine. However, as the trade have become accustomed to colored goods, we could not at this late hour get them accustomed to the uncolored product. Why should color be prohibited from butterine and not from butter? The same color is used in similar quantities in both articles.

We see from the statement of Mr. Miller that he claims that butter was almost universally sold in its natural state at the time when butterine was first manufactured, while the butterine was of a very high color. This I know from experience to be entirely without foundation; not one word of truth in it. The situation was then as it is to-day—that the natural butter during that time of the year when the cow feeds on green grass was yellow, and that the consumer then as now preferred a uniform color the

year throughout, wherefore coloring was resorted to years before we knew anything of oleomargarine. The opponents of this bill have acknowledged or advised us that carrots were used for butter coloring before liquid color or oleomargarine was discovered.

We also find that Mr. Miller claims that about the same proportion of coloring is needed for butter as for oleomargarine. I think that any man with common sense that knows anything about the natural color of butter, and knows anything about the natural color of lard and tallow, which are the principal ingredients of oleomargarine, will know that it does not take as much color to color butter at such times when it is the product of green grass, and even in the dead of winter, when the producers of butter are now feeding their cows ground feed, which helps along to give color to winter butter, but not enough but what some coloring must be used. In contrast to this we have the natural color of the principal ingredients of oleomargarine, which are lard and tallow, and which we know are about as white as snow at all times of the year.

I find Mr. Miller states that if we had started out using no coloring whatever we would doubtless have had as large a business established on uncolored to-day as we have on colored. In answer to this I must state that my views are that the manufacturers of oleomargarine started in and have ever since been manufacturing their product to look as much as possible like unto butter. I find the following inscription on the front of Mr. Dodson's oleomargarine factory, which is situated within sight of our Capitol here, "The cow herself couldn't tell it." Why such a sign as this in front of an oleomargarine factory if the proprietors do not wish to convey the idea to the trade that they have a substitute so good, so exact, that the cow herself could not tell it?

C. N. Lavery, representing Swift & Co., said:

We claim the same right to color oleomargarine yellow that a creamery claims to color butter, and most respectfully ask this committee not to vote to prohibit the use of a harmless coloring in one in favor of the other. It is a well-known fact that the manufacturer of oleomargarine first conceived the idea of giving his product a uniform color, thereby rendering it more pleasing to the eye by the use of a harmless coloring. The creameries throughout the country, taking advantage of the idea suggested, adopted the same color as their standard. They found it improved the appearance of butter as well as of oleomargarine. Now these same creameries come before Congress and ask to have a law enacted to force the manufacturer of oleomargarine to abolish the use of coloring, claiming that they have the exclusive right to its use. The creamery interests have no more right to say we shall not color oleomargarine than we have to say they shall not color butter. It has been said that if Congress forbids the coloring of oleomargarine it should also forbid the coloring of butter. This is wrong. Congress should not forbid the coloring of either, but should encourage the coloring of these products in order to enhance the value and sightliness of both.

We find that Mr. Lavery also advances the idea that oleomargarine was the first to use color, and that the creameries throughout the country took advantage of the idea suggested and adopted the same color. Let me here read to you a message from Wells, Richardson & Co., Burlington, Vt.:

HERMAN B. DAHLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Have manufactured butter color for over twenty-five years. Sold first in bottles, later in bulk.

WELLS, RICHARDSON & CO.

This I know to be true, because I have sold it myself to producers of butter, who bought it for their butter because we told them to use it.

I am the son of O. B. Dahle, who has been a merchant in the town of Perry, Dane County, Wis., from 1853 to 1896, and I know that many of these parties who have sent me the different letters and messages concerning this bill remember him since away back. He handled butter since I was a small boy. It is now between twenty-five and thirty years since we found it necessary to induce our customers to use butter color for their butter during that portion of the year when the cows could not feed on grass, because the parties to whom we consigned our shipments informed us that they could realize a better price for the same when it bore the same color the year around.

I myself have dealt in or have been a manufacturer of butter the last twenty-three years when I have been in business, and have found the same rule existing up to the present time—that consumers wish butter to have the same color the entire year; wherefore we have to use color when the cow, according to the laws of nature, must subsist on dry feed.

Besides this, let me read you a letter that I received from John S. Martin & Co., one of the oldest and leading butter houses of New York City, which letter I believe fairly, squarely, and truthfully explains the situation as to whether butter is colored to imitate oleomargarine or vice versa:

NEW YORK.

DEAR SIR: We learn that the oleomargarine interests are representing that butter was and is colored in imitation of their article. One can scarcely believe that any sane individual would make such a statement or accept the responsibility for such an untruth, and still those engaged in the butter business (we have been established nearly fifty years) know there is no statement so wild or untrue that will not be made by the supporters of this miserable fraud on the consumer.

In fact, the entire history of oleomargarine from its very inception has

been one gigantic misrepresentation, and it remains to be seen whether the few manufacturers who have made enormous profits out of the business shall be allowed to continue to humbug the public and at the same time destroy one of the most prominent of our agricultural interests. While the majority in the Senate may not be as pronounced as in the House, we can not but believe that its passage is probable.

We are, dear sir, very truly, yours,

JOHN S. MARTIN & CO.

P. S.—Dealers in butter know full well and will affirm that coloring has been, and is now, used solely to establish uniformity in the productions of the different seasons of the year.

HON. HERMAN B. DAHLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Next we will hear from Mr. L. S. Taylor, secretary of Elgin Board of Trade, the organization which, according to a statement made before our committee by a party not friendly to this bill, is the corporation which makes the price of butter for the United States. I agree to a considerable extent with the parties who made such assertion. The situation being thus we can accept their statement with confidence and full reliance. This is what they say:

HERMAN B. DAHLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Elgin Board of Trade was organized in 1872. Ever since then members have used butter color, and it was used by creamery men and farmers before that time.

L. S. TAYLOR, Secretary.

I will now read you a statement from the president of the Chicago Butter and Egg Board:

HERMAN B. DAHLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Have handled butter in Chicago market for twenty-eight years, and during all that time it has been colored.

Next I will read from the president of the Illinois Dairy Union, Chicago, Ill.:

HERMAN B. DAHLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

I have been handling butter on this market over thirty years, and during all this time much of it was colored.

GEO. W. LINN.

Next let me read you from one of the principal houses in New York City, which has been in the butter trade since 1855, and this is what they say:

NEW YORK.

DEAR SIR: Have sold colored butter for forty years, long before oleomargarine was made. This is literally true. This house has been in the butter trade since 1855, and one of the original members is still connected with it. During our connection with the trade butter has always been colored. Oleo has been colored to imitate the appearance of butter in order to deceive the consumer.

Yours, truly,

EGBERT & CASE.

HON. HERMAN B. DAHLE.

Mr. Speaker, I have now read to you expressions from what I consider the very best and most reliable authority touching on this particular point, and I know and feel perfectly sure and certain with myself that what these parties have here advised are facts, pure and simple.

Mr. John Dadie, representing W. J. Moxley, of Chicago, Ill., said:

Now, the contention advanced by the parties interested in the passage of this bill is that they do not want oleomargarine colored in imitation of natural butter, and I want to say most emphatically to the members of this committee that oleomargarine is not colored to represent natural butter, and further, that practically speaking no such thing as natural butter is offered for sale in any market; it is all artificially colored; and further, that if not artificially colored six months out of the year, it could not be sold other than at a sacrifice. Why are these people not honest in their statement, and why is it they attempt to conceal the fact that butter is artificially colored and is not natural, as they falsely represent it to be? Why should the producers of butter—who are the framers of this bill—attempt to secure to themselves the exclusive use of color, when the manufacturer of oleomargarine is responsible for its introduction as an article of commerce? Their answer is, to prevent oleomargarine being sold as butter.

Well, then, I say let the producers of butter discontinue the use of artificial color and sell their butter in its natural state, and no one will be deceived in purchasing oleomargarine. Is it not as fair a proposition to say that butter should be sold free from color as to deny its use in a rival product? Is this question not pertinent when it is remembered that the article of color is the property of the oleomargarine manufacturers by right of priority and constant use? The producers of butter were quick to see the advantages derived from the use of this color, and it is now used in common by oleomargarine and butter makers alike. From this it would appear that if any rights are to be protected by legislative enactment, in so far as color is concerned, the makers of oleomargarine are entitled to such protection, and we emphatically protest against the passage of any law that gives to the dairy interests exclusive rights on color and denies that right to ourselves.

Gentlemen, I solemnly protest against unwise and vicious legislation of this kind, and I appeal to your business judgment when you deliberate on this question among yourselves. I protest against the passage of the Grant bill. It is an invasion of our rights; it is practically a confiscation of our property interests, and unjust to the producer and consumer alike. Everybody knows that on a farm, before oleomargarine was ever invented, people used to grate carrots and used other things to color their butter, but it is a fact that butter had not been colored to any extent until after oleomargarine was manufactured and colored, and that the introduction of color is the result of the introduction of oleomargarine as an article of commerce.

Mr. Dadie expresses himself most emphatically, declaring that oleomargarine is not colored to represent natural butter. Since I have spoken on this subject it is not necessary to go over that again. He then asks why are these people not honest in their statements, and why is it that they attempt to conceal the fact

that butter is colored. In answer to same let me here again announce that butter is colored to suit our own—that is the consumers—fancy at such times as the natural product is not of high enough color, and the producers of butter do not deny that.

Mr. Dadie states that the passage of the Grout bill is an invasion of their rights, practically a confiscation of their property interests. When I think of this I can not but think of the statement of the one of these oleomargarine representatives advising us of the fact that they—that is, the oleomargarine manufacturers—having agents all over the United States disposing of their goods, so that the factory which Mr. Dadie represents, according to last statement given by their bookkeeper to one of our mercantile agencies, claimed plants, factory, and machinery worth \$30,850.63, and I then think of Mr. Dadie's statement made July 1, 1898, to one of our mercantile agencies claiming a surplus for his firm of \$100,000, and on November 6 of the following year claims a surplus of \$200,000.

Mr. Speaker and fellow-members, if there is any confiscation of the rights, that confiscation is now and has been perpetrated by the manufacturers of oleomargarine, having agents all over the United States, the majority of which now have passed bills against the sale of colored oleomargarine, so that this very representative, Mr. Dadie, can one year claim a surplus of \$100,000 on no larger plant than they have, according to their own statement, and then the very next year claim a surplus of \$100,000 more.

Mr. Hobbs, editor of National Provisioner of New York and Chicago, stated:

The French colored oleomargarine, too, before the American dairyman found that this coloring evened up his rich and poor butter to one selling standard, then finding the deception a good one the dairyman desires the sole right after stealing the hues of Napoleon poor-man butter to use coloring in butter. Our dairies will not, as a rule, pasteurize or sterilize their cream because it kills that sacred flavor; without being so treated cream has a lurking evil positively dangerous in its original raw and tuberculous state, coming as it does from uninspected cows grazing anywhere, drinking any sort of water, sleeping in filthy and foul influences, and existing in insanitary surroundings and uncouth barns.

Ask the agricultural experiment stations of this country, when they have examined milk and the cattle that give it, to what extent are the milk cows infected with dangers to our system. Ask the question not only in our own land, but in all other countries. The answer as I heard it is simply appalling, and yet the butter people stand up before Congress with their inviolated product, produced from the milk of uninspected cows, and ask that the product made from sterilized cream and the purified oils of Government-inspected stock be driven from the market for the unclean thing which we eat and whose assassination of us we excuse simply because it smells nice.

Does Congress desire to form and wield together a butter trust? Creameries now get higher prices for commercial butter than ever before in the history of the industry; then, too, in face of the fact that methods are cheaper to work out, machinery is cheaper, milk is no dearer; butter is, however, dearer; the milk farmer gets about \$1.10 per 100 pounds of 5 per cent cream milk. About 15 cents' worth of milk makes 1 pound of butter, for which the groceries have paid as high as 30 cents a pound wholesale. This year it is lower now. The creamery folks made 15 cents a pound, and the grocer got 2 cents a pound, even after a lot of the water, for which he paid 30 cents a pound also, had evaporated after the butter reached his store.

No wonder the butter factories do not wish to let the grocer sell butterine. Will Congress step in, on top of all this, and put the requisite 10 cents per pound additional tax on butterine, wiping the product from the market, and thus cement the structure of the butter combine? The good sense of Congress is not yet ready, I feel, to mark up prices to the consumer, to mark up still higher the steep profit of the butter factory, and in doing so imperil millions upon millions illegitimate fields affected by oleomargarine and the manufacture of it.

How about pure winter butter as a counterfeit and a fraud upon the consumer in the guise of rich summer butter and at the price of it? The winter butter of any cow is 30 to 40 percent poorer in butter fats than is the product from her rich summer cream. Butter color is used instead of grass to cover up the difference in rich quality. By these simple dyeing processes the low-grade, whitish, winter, waxy stuff is made to look like a superior summer substance, and to sell for the same price, so this 40 per cent counterfeit is evened up and shoved out into the current of trade as the simon-pure, virgin article. It is a fraud. If a light buff, summer product, its natural color, would be placed alongside of the white, winter, waxy on the same counter, the housewife would severely let the poor white stuff alone. Yet some people ask Congress to tax a pure and wholesome product that the dairies might get higher prices for their deceptions. The few noisy dairymen and others that are not real dairymen who go to form what is swung in under the high-sounding name of the National Dairy Union are a curious lot. They come together as a combine in convention and protest as a crowd, and they go home and protest again as separate concerns; then they stand out by themselves and protest as businesses. Finally they write individual protests to Congressmen.

I would judge from this man's testimony that he ought never to eat any of the butter of trade nor oleomargarine, since he claims that the ordinary cream from which butter is made has a lurking evil, positively dangerous, and since oleomargarine, especially the best of it, contains the product of just the same kind of milk as butter does. I know that it is claimed that we may contract certain diseases from infected milk. At the same time we all know that the very large majority of our people use unsterilized milk; and Mr. Hobbs must not understand that the friends of the Grout bill wish in any way to inflict any hardship or injustice to parties wishing to use oleomargarine, whether colored or uncolored, because even the colored, with the additional 8 cents tax, will not average in cost with the jobbing price of creamery butter. We members of Congress who are friends of this bill do not desire or wish to form and weld together a butter trust, as is charged by him, and I absolutely deny that the passage of this bill can have that effect. I notice that Mr. Hobbs states that the creameries now

get higher prices for commercial butter than ever before in the history of the industry. I will here introduce butter prices for sixteen years, so that you can all see the situation:

Butter prices for sixteen years.
[In cents per pound.]

Month.	1885.	1886.	1887.	1888.
January.....	20½ to 27½	16½ to 26	20 to 27½	19 to 27½
February.....	19½ to 26½	18½ to 27½	17½ to 24½	20 to 26½
March.....	20½ to 28½	22½ to 29½	21½ to 29½	23½ to 28½
April.....	19½ to 25½	22½ to 27½	20½ to 25½	23½ to 26½
May.....	17½ to 21½	14½ to 19½	18½ to 21½	23½ to 24½
June.....	13½ to 16½	13 to 16½	14½ to 16½	18½ to 19½
July.....	14 to 17	13 to 16½	16½ to 19½	18½ to 18½
August.....	14½ to 18½	15½ to 19½	17½ to 22½	17½ to 18½
September.....	15½ to 18½	17½ to 22½	17½ to 22½	18½ to 21½
October.....	16½ to 21½	21 to 25½	18 to 24	20 to 23½
November.....	16½ to 23½	20½ to 26½	19½ to 25½	22½ to 26½
December.....	16½ to 25½	20 to 28	19 to 26½	24½ to 28½
Average.....	17½ to 22½	17½ to 23½	18½ to 23½	20½ to 24½

Month.	1889.	1890.	1891.	1892.	1893.	1894.
January.....	21½ to 26	17	23	22½	24½	21½
February.....	21 to 26½	14½	23½	24½	25½	21½
March.....	22½ to 25½	20½	20	23½	25½	18½
April.....	22½ to 24½	16½	25	20½	27½	19½
May.....	16½ to 18½	14½	18½	16½	23½	15½
June.....	16 to 17½	12½	17½	17½	18½	16
July.....	15½ to 16½	13½	16½	16½	19½	16½
August.....	15½ to 18½	15½	17½	20½	20½	19½
September.....	18 to 19½	18½	20½	20½	20½	20½
October.....	19½ to 23½	19½	21½	21½	21½	20½
November.....	19½ to 23½	22½	23½	23½	24½	20½
December.....	19½ to 23½	20½	22½	23½	24	17½
Average.....	18½ to 21½	17½	21½	21½	23½	18½

Month.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.
January.....	17½ to 17½	17½	13½	18½	17½	25½ to 32
February.....	16½ to 16½	16½	14½	17	20	25½ to 28
March.....	16½ to 16½	17½	14½	18½	20	2½ to 28
April.....	16½ to 16½	14½	15½	18½	18½
May.....	15½ to 15½	13½	15½	15½	17½
June.....	15½ to 15½	13½	12½	15½	17½
July.....	15½ to 15½	13½	12½	15½	17½
August.....	16½ to 16½	13½	12½	17	17½
September.....	17 to 17	13½	14½	17½	20½
October.....	18½ to 18½	14½	16½	18½	21
November.....	18½ to 18½	15½	17½	19½	25
December.....	20 to 20	15½	17½	18½	25½
Average.....	16½	14½	14½	16½	18½

It seems that this man absolutely knows nothing about what he speaks of. He states "that methods are cheaper to work out." Can any butter man explain to me what this means? Machinery is cheaper—I have myself been buying creamery machinery ever since we got separator creameries in my county, and I can not find that any such condition exists. "Milk is no dearer; butter is, however, dearer." I find that the price of butter in every case governs the price of milk. The creamery is very often operated by the farmers themselves, in which case necessary expenses are deducted from the net amount received for butter manufacture, and the balance is divided up among the farmers, or else the creamery owner, where the creameries are running that way, has a certain pay for manufacturing the butter, in which case, of course, the patrons' net receipts depend upon the price of butter.

He then states that the farmer gets about \$1.10 per 100 pounds of 5 per cent cream milk. I wish that you all knew how far from the fact this is. About 15 cents' worth of milk makes a pound of butter, according to Mr. Hobbs's statement, for which the grocer has paid as high as 30 cents a pound, the creamery folks thus making 15 cents a pound, and the grocer getting 2 cents a pound profit. Fellow-members, I wish you all knew what exaggeration this is. As I have stated before, I was the first party in my neighborhood to go into this business, and I certainly could not expect to be elected by these same people to represent them here in Congress if I committed such a tremendous injustice toward my patrons as the charging them with one-half of the price of the butter I manufactured for my work. Mr. Hobbs's next statement is:

No wonder that butter factories do not wish to let the grocer sell butterine. Will Congress step in on top of all this and put the requisite 10 cents a pound additional tax on butterine, wiping the product from the market, and thus cement the structure of the butter combine? The good sense of Congress is not yet ready, I feel, to mark up prices to the consumer, to mark up still higher the steep profit of the butter factory, and in doing so imperil millions upon millions illegitimate fields affected by oleomargarine and the manufacture of it.

I do not expect that there is much necessity of answering this last clause. We friends of the Grout bill do not expect to prohibit

the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine to those who want it, but since we find that the easiest way of selling colored oleomargarine is to mark it and sell it a trifle less than the honest dealer can sell pure creamery butter, this is the reason we have so many that are selling it illegally, and these are the fellows that we are after. I sincerely trust that everyone who will read the balance of Mr. Hobbs's speech will agree with me that he knows nothing about what he is speaking of—for instance, when he tries to ridicule the National Dairy Union. Allow me to inform you that I know several members of this union, and I have received letters from many other members of this union; but not one of them is as flighty or have I found to be as flighty in his own imagination as Mr. Hobbs himself. I have found that both the president, Governor Hoard, of my own district, and Mr. Knight, secretary of the association, have been doing very good, able, and just work for the organization which they represent; and Mr. Charles Y. Knight informed our committee that he had been the secretary of the National Dairy Union the past three years, an organization of farmers who keep cows, and others engaged in pursuits allied therewith, which organization at present comprises about 30,000 members who are farmers scattered all over the United States.

The organization has for its aim the protection of producers and consumers of dairy products against fraud. Its officers serve absolutely without further compensation than their actual and necessary expenses incurred in the discharge of their duty. No officer has ever received one cent salary, but upon the other hand they have spent hundreds of dollars in expenses while working in the interests of the cause, for which no account has ever been rendered the organization. Mr. Knight further states that "I have had charge of the work of organization and the collection of facts regarding the oleomargarine traffic of this country, and it is the enormous illegal and fraudulent growth of the business during the past two years, in the face of the best restrictive laws the States have been able to devise, that has brought us to Congress as a last resort to ask for relief."

CONGRESS OUR LAST RESORT.

We must all believe that our present oleomargarine law, when it was passed, was passed in the hope and with the idea that it would be lived up to; that oleomargarine would not only pay duty or internal revenue to the Government, which it does, but that it would be properly branded and marked and sold to the retailers, and by them to customers, for what it is. In this we can see how greatly the framers of the law have erred. Let us not now take any more risks; let us pass this bill. Then the poor man who needs and wants something cheaper to eat can get it, and then the rich man can also be supplied with oleomargarine if he wishes it in preference to butter, or butter in preference to oleomargarine, and feel sure he gets it.

Reapportionment Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDGAR D. CRUMPACKER,

OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, January 7, 1901.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 12740) making an apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Twelfth Census—

Mr. CRUMPACKER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The measure under consideration is one of more than ordinary consequence. It is always important to have the political power of the Government justly divided among the States, but in view of the distribution of population it is impossible to do exact justice between them. All plans for the apportionment of Representatives must be more or less arbitrary. The question between the bills presented for consideration is one of little importance, viewed from a business standpoint. If the number should be changed twenty-five or thirty either way from the existing standard, it would not appreciably affect the character of the House as a legislative body. There is more objection to the Hall and its present arrangement than to the size of its membership. It is difficult to conceive of a more unsatisfactory place in which to transact public business.

The character of the House depends altogether upon the rules and the personnel of the membership, and everyone here knows that if the membership were increased to 400 under the existing rules business would be dispatched with the same facility that it is now. This body is relatively smaller than the popular branch of the legislature of any of the great governments of civilization, and nominally smaller than most of them.

I am profoundly impressed with the fact that the House is

undergoing a radical change in character and function. It is losing the position the fathers intended it should occupy as the great forum of the people. Its independence is being destroyed by Executive suggestion on the one hand and Senatorial encroachment upon the other. It is being ground to death between the upper and the nether millstones. Whenever a measure of any importance is proposed the first question asked is, not whether it is just and right, but what does the President think of it, does he favor it? If he has been consulted and his approval obtained, the next question is, will the Senate consent to it? If so, it may receive consideration, otherwise not. The duties of the House under the Constitution are of secondary importance. It does its work at the bidding of others, and yet the people hold it responsible.

It is the duty of the House to pass such measures as it deems necessary for the welfare of the country, and if the Senate does not concur, the people will know where the responsibility belongs. If the President does not believe any particular measure to be wise or just, the Constitution very clearly points out a method by which he may effectually express his disapproval, and the people will then know where the responsibility lies. The existing system is the expression of party instead of parliamentary government, and it has resulted in destroying not only the independence of the House as a legislative organ, but in repressing the independence of the members as well.

But, sir, I have no disposition to criticize the President or the Senate for a custom that has its origin in conditions near half a century old. The blame rests with members of the House and with the people. They, and they alone, have the power to administer a remedy.

But enough upon that subject. As between the bill reported by the committee and the measure known as the Burleigh bill, I am in favor of the latter, because, among other things, it provides for an enlargement of the House to correspond in some degree to the growth of population in the country. Then, the method of apportionment pursued in the committee bill is unjust, and therefore it is wrong. It is said to be scientific, but it can not be, because it is both complicated and unfair.

Under that theory, with a membership of 350, the State of Colorado is given 3 members, but with a membership of 357 it only gets 2. If that State is entitled to 3 as its relative share of 350 members, equitably apportioned, with an aggregate membership of 357 the right of Colorado to 3 members would be strengthened. That proposition is self-evident, yet upon the theory of the bill an increase in the aggregate membership of 7 decreases Colorado's representation 1 vote. And they tell us that the theory is eminently scientific. It is preeminently absurd and unjust.

If Colorado is justly entitled to 3 out of 350, it is a gross injustice to give her only 2 out of 357. If she is entitled to only 2 out of 357, it is an injustice to the other States to accord that State 3 out of 350. It must be wrong and unjust in one instance or the other. Upon that theory of reckoning the State of Maine is entitled to a representation of 4 out of a total membership of 383, but increase the membership to 390 and Maine only gets 3. But the theory is scientific, and the bill is designed more to vindicate the theory than to equitably apportion Representatives among the several States.

Why not adopt the plain, simple, old-fashioned method of the people? Determine upon a ratio and then give each State one member for each full unit of population and one for every fraction over half. That is the plan employed by the people, and it is just and generally understood. The committee bill deserves defeat on account of its theory—a theory full of paradoxes and absurdities; a theory that is palpably unjust.

The Burleigh bill is said to proceed upon that ridiculous "scientific" theory up to a certain point, but I have examined it in detail and find that it does justice to all the States. It accords each State one Representative for each unit of 194,182 population and one for each major fraction.

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will.

Mr. HOPKINS. Under a House of 386 members, does not Pennsylvania have a major fraction of more than 120,000 without representation?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Not upon our theory.

Mr. HOPKINS. Oh, yes. And does not New York have a major fraction of more than 115,000 without any representation?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Not upon our theory.

Mr. HOPKINS. But upon a House of 386 members it is a fact, is it not, that my statement is true?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, I am not prepared to answer hypothetical questions.

Mr. HOPKINS. There is nothing hypothetical about it. The Burleigh bill, which you now speak of, says that the membership of the House, under that apportionment, shall consist of 386 members. Now, that bill, with 386 members, leaves a major fraction of more than 120,000 in Pennsylvania that is not represented and a major fraction of more than 115,000 in New York that is unrepresented.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I submit not.

Mr. CORLISS. And Michigan.

Mr. HOPKINS. And, as the gentleman from Michigan says, and Michigan also.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Oh, no.

Mr. CORLISS. Indeed it does.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I beg to differ. The bill accords a member to every major fraction.

Mr. PEARSON. That is on a total of 384.

Mr. HOPKINS. But on the bill you make the membership 386. Turn to the tables of 386 and you will find my statement to be absolutely correct.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That may be true, but for the last fifteen minutes I have been undertaking to impeach the integrity and fairness of your tables. That is what I complain of. Your tables are wrong.

Mr. HOPKINS. It is conceded by the friends of the Burleigh bill that their bill is predicated upon those figures, and if you impeach the figures then you impeach the Burleigh bill.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No, sir; here is the difference. Take a ratio of 194,182 and give each State a Representative for every unit and one for every majority fraction and it makes a total membership of 386. That is the theory of the Burleigh bill. The aggregate membership is ascertained by the calculation after having fixed upon the ratio, while under the other theory the membership is first settled and the ratio ascertained by dividing the whole population by the fixed number of members. That theory, in nine instances out of ten, will leave several States with majority fractions unrepresented. That is illustrated in the committee bill. The States of Colorado, Florida, and North Dakota have such fractions, but they receive no representation on account of them.

I have already shown that under the theory of the distinguished chairman of the committee, with a total membership of 350, Colorado would have 3 Representatives, and by increasing the aggregate membership by 7 that State would have only 2. The larger the House the smaller the apportionment to Colorado!

THE CONSTITUTIONAL PLAN.

But, sir, neither of the pending bills conforms to the constitutional requirements for the apportionment of Representatives among the States. The constitutional plan is contained in the second section of the fourteenth amendment, which I will read:

Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

It will be observed, Mr. Speaker, that the Constitution bases representation upon population entirely, but if any State shall have disfranchised any of its male inhabitants 21 years of age who are citizens of the United States, except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation of such State "shall be reduced"—note the word "shall"—in the proportion that the disfranchised citizens bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years old in the State. Let me illustrate: If a State with a population of 1,500,000 should disfranchise 40 per cent of its male citizens 21 years of age, except for crime, its basis of representation would be reduced in the same proportion, and it would be accorded representation upon a basis of 900,000 instead of 1,500,000.

It is as much a part of the constitutional plan to reduce the basis of representation wherever there have been disfranchisements to any considerable extent, as it is to base representation upon population at all. The provision is plain, clear, and mandatory, and can not be ignored except by the arbitrary will of Congress. The importance of that provision of the Constitution can not be overestimated. The power of establishing qualifications for suffrage rests exclusively with the States, subject only to the limitation that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

A State may fix an age limit so high that it would disfranchise 50 per cent of its male citizens, or impose a property qualification that would operate in the same manner, or establish a literary standard for suffrage that would disfranchise all who are unable to read and translate the Greek language, without violating any Federal law. The only repressive force under the control of Congress to prevent abuses of the vast power in the respective States over the control of suffrage is the reduction of representation. Abnormal local conditions might incite a State to so circumscribe the elective franchise that its government would be republican in form only. Shall the only corrective power for such abuses that resides in Congress be abrogated by passive nullification?

Congress is bound to know the facts of current history in all the

States and disclosures made by State laws and the public records of the country. I make the assertion that there is not a member of this body that does not know to a moral certainty that States in the Union have disfranchised male citizens to such an extent as to deprive them of several Representatives under the constitutional plan of apportionment.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will with pleasure.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I understand the gentleman has a bill which reduces the representation in accordance with the theory which he is now advancing. I want to ask him if he has included in that bill a provision for a reduction of the representation of all the States that have reduced the suffrage.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will say in reply to the gentleman, the only States not included in the bill that I have any doubt about are Tennessee and Florida. I carefully analyzed the situation in all the other States, and in none has there been sufficient disfranchisements by the direct and necessary operation of law to justify a reduction of membership. I do not include the suppression of votes by the unfair administration of the law.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I want to ask further of the gentleman. Does he think that as to every State that has reduced the suffrage—reduced the number of voters—under the constitutional requirement, that his bill should go to the extent of reducing the representation of every such State?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Most certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Now, take Tennessee. We have a limitation of the suffrage, first by requiring persons to pay poll taxes before they can vote. That is devoted exclusively to school purposes, without regard to race. In addition to that, we have a limited registration in certain towns and counties; and in addition to that, we have a modified Australian ballot. Does the gentleman think it practicable, or possible, to ascertain with any degree of certainty how many people are disfranchised by those suffrage qualifications?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have no doubt that it can be ascertained with practical certainty, but the gentleman should bear in mind that there is a wide distinction between regulations calculated to secure the orderly administration of elections and the purity of the ballot on the one hand and a repression of suffrage on the other.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I would be very glad to hear the gentleman on that distinction. In my poor judgment, I can not see how you are going to avoid the express language of the fourteenth amendment, which says, as the gentleman has quoted, that where a State denies suffrage for any reason except for participation in rebellion or other crimes representation shall be reduced.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It says if the right is denied or abridged. I interpret that expression to mean a denial of the right to vote, as distinguished from the limitation of its exercise in the interest of fair and orderly elections.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. That is what I want to hear the gentleman upon, if he makes that distinction.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, the gentleman from Tennessee must allow me to make my own speech—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Of course, I appreciate the gentleman's legal ability, and I want to hear him upon that point.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That general observation is all I have to make upon the point at this time. I will discuss it later.

Mr. FOX. Before the gentleman from Indiana proceeds I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Very well, if it is only a question.

Mr. FOX. I would like to ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, if there is any clause in the constitution as to male inhabitants in the State of Mississippi whose right of suffrage is denied or abridged that is not also in the constitution of Massachusetts? In other words, if the franchise clause in the constitution of the State of Mississippi is any more restrictive than the franchise clause in the constitution of Massachusetts, and if so, in what particular?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Let me say to the gentleman that admitting for the sake of the argument the proposition as he puts it, by operation of the law in the State of Mississippi over 42 per cent of the male inhabitants 21 years of age who are citizens of the United States are disfranchised, while in the State of Massachusetts not exceeding 3 per cent are disfranchised.

Mr. FOX. Will the gentleman permit me another question? Is the gentleman aware that under the census of Massachusetts, taken in 1895 under the authority of the Massachusetts State law, there were nearly 800,000 male inhabitants over 21 years of age subject to a poll tax, and in the Congressional elections last November there were only about two hundred and eighty-odd thousand votes polled?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will answer that question by asking the gentleman another. Is he willing to have the question settled by the vote actually polled? If he is, I will consent.

Mr. FOX. That is not answering my question.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not attach so much importance to the vote as I do to my ability to demonstrate, almost to a mathematical certainty, the number of voters disfranchised in the State of Mississippi and the State of Massachusetts by the necessary operation of laws. There is 6.6 per cent of the male population in Massachusetts 21 years of age illiterate, and about half of that is composed of foreigners who have never been naturalized. Representation shall be reduced on account of the disfranchisement of citizens, not aliens. An investigation of the facts discloses that Massachusetts has not disfranchised a sufficient number of citizens to affect a reduction of representation.

Mr. FOX. Just one further question and I will not interrupt the gentleman further. While that is a proper construction of the Constitution, is it not a fact that notwithstanding these aliens, who have not been naturalized and are therefore not citizens of the United States, are enumerated in the census and go to make up the population?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; that is exactly according to the constitutional scheme of apportionment.

It has been argued in the course of this debate that the fourteenth amendment was abrogated by the adoption of the fifteenth. While it is true that both of those amendments were originally designed for the protection of the negro, their provisions are general and they apply alike to all classes of people. There is no repugnance between them. Prior to their adoption States had the power to disfranchise citizens for any reason with perfect impunity. Under the original method of apportionment representation was distributed according to the number in the respective States, counting all free persons and three-fifths of the slaves.

No slave was allowed to vote, and after their status had become that of freemen, under emancipation, they were all counted in apportioning Representatives. It was not at first expected that they would be given the right of suffrage, and the fourteenth amendment was intended to give them citizenship and leave the question of their political privileges entirely with the States, but if any State should disfranchise them its representation should be reduced accordingly.

That was the original plan of reconstruction. It was supposed that the importance of an increased share of political power in the Government that would result would induce the insurrectionary States to prepare the negro for suffrage and accord him the right as rapidly as they could do so without injury to their local affairs. But the fear was still entertained that the negro would be held in political bondage, notwithstanding the provisions of the fourteenth amendment, and in the light of unjust and barbarous laws enacted by some of those States, aimed at the colored race, that fear was well founded. The result was the fifteenth amendment. That amendment provides that—

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

While, as I have said, both amendments were primarily designed for the protection of the negro, they are general in their provisions and include citizens of all races and colors. Both amendments are active and operative. No State may disfranchise citizens on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, but they may disfranchise on any other account. But, sir, if they restrict the right of suffrage of male citizens 21 years of age by raising the age limit, by educational laws, by property qualifications, or by any other method within their constitutional authority, except for crime, the basis of representation must be reduced accordingly.

We hear it said that it is not possible to ascertain the exact number disfranchised by the operation of law in any State. Suppose that were true, shall we suffer the constitutional liberties of 8,000,000 citizens to be destroyed because absolute exactness can not be attained? What law operates with exact justice upon all citizens? Practical certainty is all that can be achieved in the most important affairs of the people. If we wait, sir, until we can embody absolute truth, absolute justice in our laws, we would as well close the doors of this Hall and go about our business. But there is no difficulty in ascertaining with reasonable certainty the number of disfranchisements occasioned by educational and property laws. The facts can all be gotten from public records. The census reports show the number of illiterates and other statistical records show other essential facts.

QUALIFICATIONS AND REGULATIONS.

But gentlemen who oppose the enforcement of the reduction provisions of the Constitution tell us that it will involve an endless amount of work and then the result must be more or less speculative. It is well to bear in mind the distinctions between qualifications which restrict the right of suffrage and regulations prescribing the method of exercising that right. The Australian system of voting, the official ballot, registration laws, whether a fee be charged the voter for registration or not, primary laws and requirements of the same general character which affect the mode of exercising the right of suffrage rather than the right

itself are mere regulations for the orderly administration of elections and to protect their purity, and though they incidentally abridge and occasionally deny a voter the right of suffrage, they are not disfranchisements and do not disqualify voters within the meaning of the Constitution.

Restrictions upon the exercise of the elective franchise, reasonably necessary for the integrity of elections, are not denials or abridgments of the right itself within the meaning of the law. The people, in adopting the fourteenth amendment, intended it to have a practical operation, and it must be construed in conformity with the custom and necessity for holding elections under reasonable safeguard to secure correct and honest results. Nor, sir, are provisions in State constitutions and laws denying the right of suffrage to idiots, insane persons, and persons under guardianship limitations upon the right of suffrage. The act of voting involves the exercise of the will, and that class of persons are presumed to have no will in the sense of the law. They are disfranchised by misfortune and would have no power to vote in the absence of any disqualifying provision. They are disfranchised by their own want of power to perform the act of suffrage. They are prohibited from voting by the common political law of the country.

A residence requirement exists in every State in the country, and while the periods are not uniform, they are substantially the same in all the States. This requirement is closely akin to a mere regulation, because a settled prior residence or domicile is absolutely essential to the protection of elections against fraud and imposition. But grant that it is a qualification, it is such a universal requirement that all the States would be affected substantially in the same degree by it; therefore, it is of no practical importance and does not constitute a denial or abridgment of suffrage within the meaning of the Constitution.

Whether the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting is a regulation or a qualification the authorities are not together upon. The late Justice Cooley in his book, *The Principles of Constitutional Law*, says:

To require the payment of a capitation tax is no denial of the right of suffrage; it is demanding only the preliminary performance of public duty, and may be classed, as may also presence at the polls, with registration or the observance of any other preliminary to insure fairness and protection against fraud.

Much may be said upon the other side of the question, but in any event it is extremely difficult to ascertain the effect of such a requirement. It can only be done by the aid of legal presumptions. The law presumes that every citizen will discharge his public obligations; that every elector will vote, and if onerous conditions are attached to the elective franchise, and electors fail to vote, the presumption will be that the failure is the result of the conditions.

But regulations may be carried to such a degree as to seriously impair the right to vote; and when they are, they become qualifications. In the State of Tennessee, in certain counties and cities, they have what is called the "Dortch law," which provides the Australian system of voting, but forbids assistance to illiterates in the preparation of their ballots. There is no direct educational requirement in the State, but no illiterate can vote under the Dortch law because he can not mark his ballot to designate his choice of candidates. Florida has a similar law. The supreme court of Tennessee has sustained the validity of the Dortch law, but the decision is in conflict with the current of judicial authority in the country.

The effect of educational laws, the most important of all as bearing upon this question in view of the conditions surrounding them, can be determined with mathematical precision. But let me repeat, Shall we consent to the nullification of the imperative mandate of the Constitution because of the difficulty in being exact? Shall we allow the highest privileges of citizenship to be taken from several million people because we can not tell exactly how many in addition have been treated likewise?

Do you say, Mr. Speaker, that this provision of the organic law should be ignored on the ground of expediency; that we should overrule the Constitution, that we all solemnly swore to support, because it would be for the best interests of the country to do so? Will our treatment of this great question on that ground inspire respect for law upon the part of the people? If we do that, we can not complain if men organize into lawless mobs and usurp the functions of courts and juries. No frenzied mob ever lighted the faggots around a trembling, pleading wretch that did not justify its action on the ground that it was subserving the best interests of society.

If the lawmakers of the country override the highest law of the land, what right have they to expect that municipal functionaries will not abrogate all laws and rules that do not measure up to their standard of ethics and convenience?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will you disfranchise Maine?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I am not in the disfranchising business. I leave that to the gentleman from Kentucky. [Laughter.]

LOUISIANA.

The State of Louisiana, in the year 1898, adopted a constitution which establishes an exceptionally high educational standard for suffrage—the highest in all the country. Registration is required preliminary to voting, and the applicant must demonstrate not only his ability to read and write, but to make arithmetical calculations as well in the presence of the registration officer.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No. I must decline to be interrupted.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Is the gentleman referring to the constitution of North Carolina?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No. I am discussing the constitution of Louisiana.

As I have said, Louisiana has the highest literary qualification for suffrage of any State in the Union, and the percentage of illiteracy in that State is higher than in any other. The expenditure for public education in that State last year was 71 cents per capita, while the average expenditure throughout the country was \$2.55 per capita. You will find, Mr. Speaker, that in States where the least money is expended for public education and the rate of illiteracy is the largest the highest intellectual standards for suffrage have been exacted. I will read the sections of the Louisiana constitution upon the suffrage question:

SEC. 3. He shall be able to read and write and shall demonstrate his ability to do so when he applies for registration, by making, under oath administered by the registration officer or his deputy, written application therefor, in the English language or his mother tongue, which application shall contain the essential facts necessary to show that he is entitled to register and vote, and shall be entirely written, dated, and signed by him, in the presence of the registration officer or his deputy, without assistance or suggestion from any person or any memorandum whatever, except the form of application hereinafter set forth: *Provided, however,* That if the applicant be unable to write his application in the English language, he shall have the right, if he so demands, to write the same in his mother tongue from the dictation of an interpreter; and if the applicant is unable to write his application by reason of physical disability, the same shall be written at his dictation by the registration officer or his deputy, upon his oath of such disability. The application for registration, above provided for, shall be a copy of the following form, with the proper names, dates, and numbers substituted for the blanks appearing therein, to wit:

I am a citizen of the State of Louisiana. My name is ———, I was born in the State (or country) of ———, parish (or county) of ———, on the ——— day of ———, in the year ———. I am now ——— years ——— months and ——— days of age. I have resided in this State since ———, in this parish ———, and in precinct No. ——— of ward No. ——— of this parish since ———, and am not disfranchised by any provision of the constitution of this State.

SEC. 4. If he be not able to read and write, as provided by section 3 of this article, then he shall be entitled to register and vote, if he shall, at the time he offers to register, be the bona fide owner of property assessed to him in this State at a valuation of not less than \$500 on the assessment roll of the current year in which he offers to register, or on the roll of the preceding year, if the roll of the current year shall not then have been completed and filed, and on which, if such property be personal only, all taxes due shall have been paid. The applicant for registration under this section shall make oath before the registration officer or his deputy that he is a citizen of the United States and of this State, over the age of 21 years; that he possesses the qualifications prescribed in section 1 of this article, and that he is the owner of property assessed in this State to him at a valuation of not less than \$500, and if such property be personal only, that all taxes due thereon have been paid.

SEC. 5. No male person who was on January 1, 1867, or at any time prior thereto, entitled to vote under the constitution or statutes of any State in the United States, wherein he then resided, and no son or grandson of any such person not less than 21 years of age at the date of the adoption of this constitution, and no male person of foreign birth who was naturalized prior to the 1st day of January, 1898, shall be denied the right to register and vote in this State by reason of his failure to possess the educational or property qualifications prescribed by this constitution: *Provided,* He shall have resided in this State for five years next preceding the date at which he shall apply for registration, and shall have been registered in accordance with the terms of this article prior to September 1, 1898, and no person shall be entitled to register under this section after said date.

The applicant for registration must not only be able to read and write, but he is required to fill out a blank application, without the aid of memorandum or suggestion by any other person, giving his name, the day, the month, and the year of his birth, his exact age in years, months, and days, the place of his birth, the place and duration of his residence, and the number of the precinct or ward in which he is a voter. In addition to all this, he must have paid a poll tax of \$1 a year, on or before the 31st day of December, for two years prior to his registration. The tax provision does not apply to persons under 23 nor over 60 years of age.

These extraordinary requirements are by indirection made applicable to the colored citizen only. No person who was a voter on the 1st day of January, 1867, or his son or grandson over 21 years of age, is subject to the qualifications. Every white man was a voter on that date and no colored man was. Was there ever a more unblushing attempt to evade the Federal Constitution? Can the highest rights of American citizenship be overthrown by such a flimsy subterfuge? The avowed purpose of the law was to disfranchise the negro. It carries on its face the stamp of dishonesty. Does anyone claim that the Louisiana system was devised to protect the ballot against illiteracy and ignorance? Why, if that were its purpose, was it not directed against ignorant and illiterate whites as well as negroes? But that was not its purpose. The president of the convention that framed the constitution, in the closing speech, said in relation to the instrument:

What care I whether it be more or less ridiculous or not? Doesn't it meet the case? Doesn't it let the white man vote, and doesn't it stop the negro from voting, and isn't that what we came here for?

A MEMBER. When was that?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. At the conclusion of the labors of the convention in June, 1898.

I submit in this point in my remarks the vote of Louisiana by Congressional districts in the year 1896, under the old constitution, and the vote at the general election in 1898, under the new constitution.

The vote by Congressional districts in that State at the general election in 1896, held under the old constitution, was:

First district	15,412
Second district	16,848
Third district	15,968
Fourth district	16,148
Fifth district	15,264
Sixth district	16,482
Average	16,020

The vote by Congressional districts in 1898 under the new constitution was:

First district	6,318
Second district	7,856
Third district	5,903
Fourth district	5,900
Fifth district	4,805
Sixth district	2,494
Average	5,546

Of the male citizens in that State 21 years of age 43.74 per cent are illiterate and disqualified from voting, and the basis of the State's representation should be reduced in that proportion. There is no speculation or guesswork about these statistics. They are taken from the records in the Census Office and are reliable. But we are reminded of the provision authorizing all citizens of the proper age to vote if they are taxed with property at the assessed valuation of \$300. In the light of the proverbial impetuosity of the Louisiana negro, but few can register under that provision. It is entirely safe to say that more will be denied registration who are returned as literates, under the extraordinary test required, than will be admitted under the property provision.

And aside from this the requirement of the payment of a capitation tax two years in advance is not only unusual but unreasonable, and it doubtless deprives a number of citizens of the right of suffrage, who are otherwise qualified.

MISSISSIPPI.

The State of Mississippi adopted a constitution in 1890 which contains this provision:

On and after the 1st day of January, 1892, every elector, in addition to the foregoing qualifications, shall be able to read any section of the constitution of this State, or shall be able to understand the same when read to him, or give a reasonable interpretation thereof.

In addition a residence of two years in the State and one year in the election district is required. The voter must also have paid all taxes assessed against him on or before February 1, before the election, including a \$2 capitation tax.

The most difficult section of the Constitution is made the test of qualification, and it is safe to assume that no one who is unable to read the constitution because of his illiteracy can understand it when read to him or give it a reasonable interpretation. A vast and dangerous discretion is given to registration officers. They pass upon the qualifications of the voters and administer the tests. But the "understanding" scheme has been entirely eliminated from the constitutional provision by the election law, which provides the pure Australian system of voting, and no illiterate is allowed assistance in the preparation of his ballot. No one can vote who can not read the constitution.

Mr. FOX. I would like to correct the gentleman, because I know he does not want to make a misstatement. I want to call his attention to the fact that the statute does provide that any illiterate who can not mark his ballot can have it marked by a third party. I myself, as a member of the State senate, was the author of that provision in the statute. I am sure the gentleman from Indiana does not wish to make a misstatement of fact. The provision is that anyone who is physically unable to make out his ballot, or, being an illiterate, is unable on that account to do so, may have the assistance of any one of the managers whom he may select.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will say that I obtained my information from high authority—from a speech made by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], which was published in the RECORD last week. He said that the Mississippi law did not permit assistance to an illiterate in the preparation of his ballot.

Mr. FOX. I do not care who may have said it, it is a mistake, as the statute itself will show. Any gentleman here who has ever read that statute knows that my statement is correct.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have in support of my statement the authority of Mr. WILLIAMS in his speech published in the RECORD.

Mr. FOX. Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FOX. I guarantee that my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] will not make such a statement, because it is not true as a matter of law.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Then he ought to expunge the RECORD, because it is there in cold type.

Mr. FOX. I can not help it. I am the author of the statute myself, and it is in the law of Mississippi.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The Mississippi constitution was framed and adopted for the avowed purpose of disfranchising colored citizens. It is no longer a secret in that State, and the law is construed and administered with that view. Its purpose is not to protect the institutions of the State from illiteracy and vice, but to reduce the negro to a condition of absolute political subjection. The supreme court of that State so declared in effect in a recent judicial opinion. In the case of *Radcliff vs. Beale* (74 Miss., 247) the court used this language:

Within the field of permissible action, under the limitations imposed by the Federal Constitution, the convention swept the circle of expedients to obstruct the exercise of the franchise by the negro race. By reason of its previous condition of servitude and dependence this race had acquired or accentuated certain peculiarities of habit, of temperament, and character, which clearly distinguished it as a race from that of the whites—a patient, docile people, careless, landless, and migratory within narrow limits, without forethought, and its criminal members given rather to furtive offenses than to the robust crimes of the whites. Restrained by the Federal Constitution from discriminating against the negro race, the convention discriminated against its characteristics and the offenses to which its weaker members were prone.

Mr. GAINES. Will my friend yield for a moment? That very opinion is quoted in the Williams case, which was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, reported in 170 United States Reports, and notwithstanding that language of the Mississippi court, Judge McKenna, for the whole court, held that the constitution of Mississippi did not infringe any rights guaranteed by the Federal Constitution.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I am familiar with the decision in the Williams case. The Supreme Court of the United States held that nothing appeared on the face or in the text of the constitution of Mississippi in conflict with the Federal Constitution. Nothing appeared in the record to show that it was not fairly administered. The court intimated that if such disclosures had been made its decision would likely have been different.

The convention swept the field of expedients. What for—to protect the people against ignorance and vice? No; but to obstruct the exercise of the elective franchise by the negro race. It could not strike at the negro as such, but it could accomplish the same thing by striking at his well-known race characteristics. The “furtive offenses” of the negro, such as bigamy, larceny, and obtaining money by false pretenses, are made the basis of disfranchisement, while the more “robust crimes” of the whites, such as robbery and murder, do not affect political rights.

Mr. FOX. To settle the controversy between the gentleman and myself, will he allow me to read the Mississippi statute?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes. I do not want to be wrong on any proposition of fact or law.

Mr. FOX. I am sure of that. Section 3666 of the Mississippi statute reads as follows:

3666. Any voter who declares to the managers of the election that, by reason of blindness or other physical disability, he is unable to mark his ballot, and whose declaration is not palpably untrue, shall, upon request, have the assistance of one of the managers in the marking thereof, and the officer shall note on the back thereof that it was marked with his assistance, but shall not otherwise give information in regard to the same. (Election ordinance, section 14.)

The next section reads as follows:

3667. A voter who declares to the managers of the election that by reason of inability to read he is unable to mark his ballot, if the same be true, shall, upon request, have the assistance of a manager in the marking thereof; and the manager shall designate one of their number for the purpose, who shall note on the back of the ballot that it was marked by his assistance; but he shall not otherwise give information in regard to the same.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is “by reason of inability to read.”

Mr. FOX. Yes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The statute is the best authority that has been submitted, and I commend it to the honorable gentleman from whom I obtained my information.

I quote from a speech made by him on Friday last, printed on page 620 of the RECORD:

It is the pure Australian ballot, as we have it in Mississippi, whether a man be allowed to vote when he can read or not, as a matter of fact he can not vote unless he can read, because he must read the names of those for whom he desires to vote, and he must put the mark opposite the name on the ticket.

Mr. CURTIS. Is he not assisted by the judge or clerk?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Not in Mississippi, unless he is blind or has lost an arm, or is otherwise physically unable.

Mr. CURTIS. In Kansas such voters are assisted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (continuing). In short, can not see to write or feel to write.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. My colleague will allow me. If he is disqualified by reason of any physical disability, then he is assisted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If any physical disability renders it impossible for him to do the work required, he is assisted. That is the pure Australian ballot as it at first came here.

At the time of the adoption of the constitution the colored voters in Mississippi outnumbered the whites about 20,000, and yet the convention that framed the instrument was composed of 134 members, of whom 133 were white and 1 was colored.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. And that 1 colored member signed the new constitution and voted for its adoption with the ordinances. He was a member of the franchise committee.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That may be true; but, sir, the complexion of that convention would indicate that there was very little danger of negro supremacy in Mississippi even before the new constitution.

Over 42 per cent of the male citizens of Mississippi 21 years of age are shown by official reports in the Census Office to be illiterate. They are disfranchised by the direct and necessary operation of election laws, and the basis of representation in that State should be reduced in the same proportion.

I submit at this place in my remarks tables showing the vote by Congressional districts in that State at the general elections in 1898 and 1900.

The vote in 1898 was:

First district.....	2,468
Second district.....	3,175
Third district.....	2,661
Fourth district.....	4,551
Fifth district.....	5,105
Sixth district.....	6,071
Seventh district.....	3,005
Average.....	4,000

The vote in 1900 was:

First district.....	6,778
Second district.....	8,048
Third district.....	3,202
Fourth district.....	9,552
Fifth district.....	9,389
Sixth district.....	8,080
Seventh district.....	6,179
Average.....	7,319

NORTH CAROLINA.

At a general election in August, 1900, the people of the State of North Carolina adopted a constitutional amendment, sections 4 and 5 of which I will read:

SEC. 4. Every person presenting himself for registration shall be able to read and write any section of the constitution in the English language, and before he shall be entitled to vote he shall have paid, on or before the 1st day of March of the year in which he proposes to vote, his poll tax, as prescribed by law, for the previous year. Poll taxes shall be a lien only on assessed property, and no process shall issue to enforce the collection of the same except against assessed property.

SEC. 5. No male person who was on January 1, 1867, or at any time prior thereto, entitled to vote under the laws of any State in the United States wherein he then resided, and no legal descendant of any such person, shall be denied the right to register and vote at any election in this State by reason of his failure to possess the educational qualification prescribed in section 4 of this article: *Provided*, He shall have registered, in accordance with the terms of this section, prior to December 1, 1900. The general assembly shall provide for a permanent record of all persons who register under this section on or before November 1, 1900, and all such persons shall be entitled to register and vote in all elections by the people in this State unless disqualified under section 2 of this article: *Provided*, Such persons shall have paid their poll tax, as required by law.

It is not to be in force until July 1, 1902, but the next general election in that State will occur in August, 1902, so for all practical purposes the amendment is operative now. It requires voters to be able to both read and write any section of the constitution and to have paid a poll tax on or before March 1 of the year in which they intend to vote. This State, like Louisiana, has the grotesque “grandfather” provision. It exempts all who were voters on the 1st day of January, 1867, and their lineal descendants, from the operation of the law. It exempts all the white citizens of the State. Why was that done? There are 50,000 white male citizens in North Carolina 21 years of age who can neither read nor write, and yet every one of them will be voters under the new constitution if the discriminating provision is valid. It is manifest that it is the purpose of the constitution to suppress the negro vote, not on account of its alleged illiteracy, but on account of prejudices against the colored race.

What justification is there for such discrimination in the State of North Carolina? It can not be in danger of negro supremacy, for only about 30 per cent of the population of that State are colored. The boasted superiority of the whites in character and intelligence ought to hold that fragment in control.

But, sir, the discriminating provisions in the constitutions of both Louisiana and North Carolina are such palpable evasions of the Federal Constitution that they will be held invalid by the courts and the standard of qualifications be applied to all alike, without regard to race or color. Talk about protecting the ballot against ignorance and vice! Why did the States attempt to allow the ignorant and vicious whites the privilege of the ballot?

North Carolina has a straight educational and poll-tax standard of suffrage, and 34.03 per cent of the male citizens 21 years of age are unlettered and unable to vote under the new constitution. The basis of representation in that State should be reduced according to that percentage.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. KLUTTZ. I will ask the gentleman if those are the statistics of 1890?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The statistics of 1890; the only available statistics.

Mr. KLUTTZ. You are not going to try us on those statistics now in advance of those of 1900, are you?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. They are current until we get returns under the census of 1900. It is not to be presumed that the percentage of illiteracy has materially decreased in the face of the fact that North Carolina expends only 53 cents per capita a year for public education as against an average of \$2.55 in all the States.

Mr. KLUTTZ. If the gentleman will permit me just a moment—I do not want to inconvenience him—I understand that he proposes to assume in advance that a certain proportion of the population of North Carolina are disfranchised before the constitution goes into effect.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. We know the number of illiterates, and under the constitution we know that illiterates can not vote. So there is no difficulty whatever in arriving at the disfranchisement in the State of North Carolina by the operation of her constitution.

Mr. BREAZEALE. Will the gentleman yield to me for one question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. BREAZEALE. I have a very high opinion of the legal ability of the gentleman, and have discussed this matter with him frequently. I want to know if he makes any distinction in the scope and operation of the fourteenth amendment between an absolute disqualification of the right of suffrage imposed by a State constitution, such as that based upon insanity, and a conditional qualification, such as the prepayment of a moderate poll tax, which is within the power of the would-be voter to comply with? What does the gentleman consider to be the legal aspect of that with reference to the power and scope of the Federal Constitution upon these questions?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Of course, I make a distinction, Mr. Speaker, because without any constitutional provision no insane person would be entitled to vote. Insanity implies the overthrow of the will. The act of voting involves an exercise of the will, and it is erroneous to suppose that statutes can disqualify the insane. Constitution or no constitution, an insane person would be disqualified by his misfortune. So that it is no disfranchisement to provide in a constitution that no insane person shall vote.

Mr. BREAZEALE. The gentleman did not refer to the second proposition.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I must insist on going on. I thought I had answered the gentleman fully.

Mr. FINLEY. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but my time has been largely taken up in answering questions.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

South Carolina adopted a new constitution in 1895, the principal provisions of which in relation to suffrage are these:

Up to January 1, 1898, all male persons of voting age applying for registration, who can read any section of this constitution submitted to them, or understand and explain it when read to them by the registration officer, shall be entitled to registration and become electors.

Any person who shall apply for registration after January 1, 1898, if otherwise qualified, shall be registered: *Provided*, That he can both read and write any section of the constitution submitted to him by the registration officer, or can show that he owns and has paid taxes collectible during the previous year on property in this State assessed at \$300 or more.

The convention that framed the constitution was created by an act of the legislature. The convention sat with closed doors, its members were not sworn, no stenographic or other report of its proceedings was allowed, and when it concluded its work it declared the constitution in force without submitting it to the people for approval or rejection.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. In what State was that?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. South Carolina.

Mr. SPIGHT. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I must be excused. My time will not permit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to be interrupted.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The South Carolina constitution, while it authorizes illiterate citizens to vote who pay taxes upon property valued at \$300 or over, is but an unqualified educational law in its operation. The election laws of that State require eight separate ballot boxes at general elections, and the voter must deposit the ballot in the proper box with his own hands. If a ballot is found in the wrong box it is rejected. Each box is labeled, and the law requires the election officers to announce to electors the character of each box, but it does not require them to instruct the voter what ballot shall be deposited in a particular box. One who can not read can not select the proper ballots for the respective boxes. What the constitution failed to do is accomplished by the election law.

The average vote in Congressional districts in that State at the

general election in 1898 was 4,524. The total vote in the State at the last Presidential election was 50,808, an average of 7,258 to the Congressional district. According to the official reports in the Census Office, 43.71 per cent of the male inhabitants of South Carolina 21 years of age are illiterate and unable to vote, and the membership of the State should be reduced from 7 to 4.

Like the other States to which I have referred, South Carolina adopted the new constitution, not for the purpose of elevating the standard of suffrage, but to disfranchise colored citizens. I will read to the House a few extracts from remarks made by conspicuous members of the constitutional convention which were published by special order, for the purpose of illustrating the spirit of the convention toward the colored race.

Hon. B. R. TILLMAN, now a United States Senator from that State, among other things, said:

It has always been my cardinal doctrine as a public man that all white men, as far as the enjoyment of the privileges of government and the emoluments of office are concerned, should be equal in this State, and that the majority alone should govern.

Hon. J. W. Gray voted against the suffrage provisions, and in explaining his vote said he voted no "because the reform faction which dominates this convention, and of which faction I am a member, is pledged not to disfranchise any white man except for crime."

After the convention had completed its work and just before its final adjournment Hon. G. D. Tillman, an influential member of the body, delivered what might be aptly termed the farewell address. In the course of his remarks he said:

Mr. President, we can all hope a great deal from the constitution we have adopted. It is not such an instrument as we would have made if we had been a free people. We are not a free people. We have not been since the war. I fear it will be some time before we can call ourselves free. I have had that fact very painfully impressed upon me several years. If we were free, instead of having negro suffrage, we would have negro slavery; instead of having the United States Government, we would have the Confederate States Government; instead of paying \$3,000,000 pension tribute, we would be receiving it; instead of having many things that we have, we would have other and better things. But to the extent that we are permitted to govern ourselves and pay pension tribute to our conquerors we have framed as good an organic law, take it as a whole, as the wisdom and patriotism of the State could have desired.

The address was received with "prolonged applause."

These are few of many expressions of similar import from leading men in those States, illustrating the feeling toward the colored race and foreshadowing the policy to be pursued.

THE RECONSTRUCTION AMENDMENTS.

But we are told that the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution were the outgrowth of a period of abnormal conditions, and that time has demonstrated their unwisdom. In what respect are they unwise? They were originally designed for protection of the negro, who had been rescued from slavery at an awful sacrifice of blood and treasure. It was thought at that time to be both unjust and unwise to allow States representation in the House and the electoral college based upon a population that was given no voice in the politics of the country.

I say it was thought unjust and unwise at that time. Does anyone claim that it would be just and wise now? The population basis for apportionment finds its support in considerations of sound public policy, but there are exceptions to all rules. It emphasizes the representative character of the voter and charges him with a sacred trust to be executed in behalf of all the people. The bonds of society firmly knit all interests together, and the welfare of the nonvoter is based upon considerations that appeal with tremendous power to the conscience and affections of all.

But there are exceptions to the general order. If a community is composed of two distinct races, between which the ties of blood and sympathy do not exist, neither race could hope for representation and protection through the other. This is the situation in some of the Southern States to-day. The antagonism between the races is such that the disfranchisement of the negro deprives him of that humane consideration in the policies of the country necessary to his proper development.

The fourteenth amendment supplies an additional bond; it links the interests of the two races together. A full allotment of political power is of the highest importance to every State. If the dominant race in the South understood that by the disfranchisement of the negro its share of national power would be reduced, it would operate as a powerful deterrent. The effect would be to prompt the States to educate the negro and prepare him for the duties of citizenship for the purpose, on the one hand, of protecting their local affairs, and, on the other, of receiving full representation in national politics. Who doubts the soundness of that philosophy? The fourteenth amendment welds the two races together by affecting a common interest, and it is the most powerful agency in the hands of Congress to accomplish the elevation of the colored man.

I know, sir, that the development of a race must come through the slow and tedious processes of natural evolution. It can not be accomplished by an act of Congress or the decree of a court, but

it may be promoted by setting in motion helpful and fostering forces in the place of influences that tend to repress and retard.

I am surprised at the sentiment against the fifteenth amendment. All of the evils involved in the reorganization of the Southern States are unjustly laid at its door. That amendment did not confer the elective franchise upon the negro. That was done by acts of Congress restoring the insurrectionary States to their natural relations with the Federal Government. The negro was no more fitted for the indiscriminate and unqualified exercise of the right of suffrage than children.

But the mistake is not chargeable to the Constitution. It is a mistake, however, to charge all of the vice and corruption of the melancholy days following reconstruction to negro suffrage. The Southern States had been dismantled and devastated by civil war. Their reconstruction involved the entire reorganization of political and social forces upon a new basis, and following the wake of war with its demoralizing effects there would have been mistakes and corruption under the best regulated suffrage. It was a period when corruption was epidemic, and the demoralization was aggravated by the irresponsible suffrage in the South.

What is the import of the fifteenth amendment that it invites so much criticism? It simply declares that no State shall disfranchise citizens on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Every safeguard for the elevation of the standard of suffrage may be established, but no citizen shall be discriminated against merely on account of race or color. Who dare advocate to the intelligence and conscience of the country that which that amendment forbids? Merit must be made the standard, virtue the measure of excellence, instead of the accidents of race or color.

Just educational and property qualifications may be enacted, laws that erect barriers against ignorance and vice, and though they operate to disfranchise a larger percentage of one race than the other, they are unobjectionable. Laws that are blind to race and color, but which strike at evil wherever it may be found and encourage virtue wherever it may exist are not only constitutional, but commendable from every standpoint. My suspicions are always aroused against a State that opposes that policy. Gentlemen protest that the Southern States are the friend of the negro, and yet they insist on the right of discriminating against him without regard to merit.

It is the wise policy of the Federal Constitution to encourage universal manhood suffrage in all the States. The strengthening and uplifting influence of the ballot are beyond calculation. Those who bear the burdens of Government and fight its battles ought to have a voice in shaping its laws and policies.

MOB LAW.

It is no secret that the negro has been denied the right of suffrage in most of the Southern States by force and fraud for the last twenty-five years. The old methods of violence have been largely superseded by election systems so craftily contrived that they accomplish the same result with a smaller expenditure of energy.

This policy has the approval of the leaders of political thought and action in that section, and, as is always the case where law is not respected, it has resulted in a sad condition of political demoralization. If the negro is not entitled to protection in the exercise of his political privileges, is he entitled to protection in the enjoyment of any other rights? If he can be handled as a political quantity without regard to the law, why may he not be treated as a social factor in the same manner? The violation of his constitutional rights in one particular suggests it in others, and it has come to be the fashion to burn, shoot, or hang him without the sanction of the law for offenses of all kinds. When respect for law shall have been destroyed, anarchy must reign. It is but one step from the oppression of the negro to the oppression of the white man.

I charge it as a sociological truth that the outrageous execution of colored men by lawless mobs is the direct result, in a large degree, of the systematic and persistent evasion of the election laws.

But, sir, I am reminded that lynchings occur in other States, and particularly in the great State which I have, in part, the distinction to represent. I am reminded that not more than four weeks ago two colored men were forcibly taken from the custody of the law by a frenzied mob in Indiana and hanged to a tree. It is with a deep sense of humiliation that I am compelled to confess the truth of that assertion. I have less respect for the perpetrators of such outrages against civilization in Indiana than I have in South Carolina, because the occasion is less. But they can not be justified in any State.

Judging from current literature, including messages of the governors of the several States, the inference would be justified that the American people are still far from a perfect civilization. But all this does not affect the truth of the assertion I made in respect to the cause of lynchings. They spread like contagion. When a shocking crime is committed by a negro, the still small voice of

suggestion prompts the outraged community in which it occurs to administer summary punishment. That has come to be the fashion, and Indiana, even, can not afford to be old-fashioned.

When a mob gets possession of a trembling miscreant, the first question is, What shall be done with him? How are such creatures disposed of in other localities? They are shot, hanged, or burned according to the state of frenzy of the crowd. A suggestion is all that is needed and the work is done. Sir, you might as well undertake to pollute one-half of Lake Michigan with the expectation that the other half would remain pure amidst all its agitations and lashings as to demoralize one-half of this country in the belief that the other half would be unaffected.

THE NEGRO AND EDUCATION.

I have no objection to literary restrictions upon the elective franchise, provided they are reasonable, honestly administered, and applied to all races and colors alike. I have already said enough to show that the educational laws in some of the Southern States are but a pretext, a makeshift, to disfranchise the colored race. Those in Louisiana and North Carolina carry indubitable proof of that assertion on their face. And what will be the next step? The best thought in the South is persuaded that the negro is not capable of elevation. His equality politically, socially, or industrially will not be tolerated. The tendency of existing conditions is to reduce him to a position of absolute subservience in all the relations of life.

It is claimed, sir, that the educated negro becomes discontented with his lot and is inspired with ambitions to advance politically and industrially. Traditional proscription will not tolerate that, and he fails in his aims and resorts to crime. They tell us that education demoralizes him, it makes him refractory, and lessens his value as a laborer, therefore he must not be educated. If the signs of the times point to any destiny for the negro, they point unerringly to his complete political subjugation and his intellectual bondage. This is no false alarm; forces are at work that can have no other result unless they are checked.

It must not be expected that the colored man will achieve the American standard of civil life without patient sacrifice and embarrassment. A virtue that comes without a struggle is of no value. Let the negro learn by experience what it costs to be a man, an American citizen in the real sense, but give him at least an opportunity to have the experience.

Only a few weeks ago Senator Bell, of Georgia, introduced a resolution in the State legislature directing the committee on education to inquire into the propriety of limiting the education of negroes to manual training only, and in a speech in the State senate in support of the resolution he said his purpose was to elevate the negro; that thirty years' experience had convinced the people of Georgia that the negro was unfitted for intellectual training; that it demoralized him. The resolution was defeated by 6 or 8 majority, but its introduction and discussion furnishes food for reflecting minds. This is a novel way of elevating a race. First political subjection, then mental darkness. It has the merit of cheapness, at least.

At a conference held at Montgomery, Ala., in May last, to discuss the race question the Hon. Hilary A. Herbert, in the course of an able speech, used this language:

The result of the expenditure of millions on negro education has been so unsatisfactory that some good people are advocating the abandonment of the system.

At that same conference Hon. A. M. Waddell, a distinguished citizen of North Carolina, spoke upon the same phase of the question with greater elaboration. I will read an extract from his address that I regard as highly significant:

The Southern people, amidst all the calamities that have befallen them, have expended about \$100,000,000 for the education of the negroes since the year 1870, and yet, with every succeeding year, they have become, as a race, less fitted for the duties of citizenship and more and more a menace to civilization and good government. These are not wild and exaggerated statements, but facts capable of proof.

The true remedy for it is to be found in the repeal or modification of the fifteenth amendment. I know that this suggestion will be regarded by most persons as one the realization of which is beyond reasonable hope, but there can be little doubt that the mind of the country, North and South, especially since the acquisition of Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, is in a more favorable condition to consider such a proposition than ever before. The repeal of the amendment would not necessarily mean the total disfranchisement of the negro.

It is stupid and criminal to force both races to live together with equal rights and privileges to each, because such a condition means, first, strife and disorder, and eventually the expulsion or annihilation of the weaker race. What does humanity, what does statesmanship—which is common sense applied to public affairs—dictate as the best and wisest course to be pursued under such conditions? Why can not the American people display the courage of their convictions on this subject? Do you tell me that education will be the cure-all for this state of things?

I yield to no man in my estimate of the supreme importance of popular education, although I know that in the country where it was developed first, even by a compulsory process, there has been and is despotism and military aristocracy; but the experience of nearly forty years in the Southern States has demonstrated that any other than industrial education for the negro simply means, in the homely phrase of Uncle Remus, "the spilling of a field hand," if not the creation of a social misfit or something worse. I do not hesitate to express the opinion that (while I would not apply the test to white

men), if it can be done by any constitutional method, it would be much wiser to require a property qualification than an educational one for the negro voter.

That statement, Mr. Speaker, expresses the philosophy of the whole situation. Southern sentiment will not tolerate the equality of the negro in any of the relations of life. If the races dwell together, the weaker one must occupy a position of complete subservience. If it grows in knowledge and character, it will assert itself and claim rights in virtue of its manhood. It must be kept in ignorance, ambition must be stifled, hope suppressed, or there will be conflict and struggle for supremacy.

The whole current of Southern thought runs in the same channel. I received through the mails yesterday a booklet written by Mr. A. F. Thomas, of Lynchburg, Va., containing a discussion of questions that will come before the Virginia constitutional convention, which will soon assemble. It contains a thoughtful discussion of the suffrage question.

The author displays exceptional ability in the treatment of the subject and a thorough familiarity with all of its aspects. But through it all, and overshadowing every idea, is the hereditary conviction that insuperable barriers preclude the possibility of the colored man occupying any other position in our civilization than that of complete subordination—a "mild form of slavery," as he expresses it. He doubtless reflects the prevailing views of thinking men who share his traditional prejudices in most parts of the South. I quote somewhat at length from his work:

Race prejudice or antagonism is a natural law, as unchangeable as the law of gravitation. Its purpose was to preserve the integrity of the species by placing in the breasts of every distinct creation antipathy to all the rest. Without this safeguard we believe the human races would long since have degenerated into a conglomerate mass of mongrels, which would have deteriorated until extinction would likely have purged the earth of such monstrosities.

Whatever the final outcome may be, it is against all analogy to suppose that amalgamation will eventuate. Both races remaining free, the tendency will be toward preservation of their parity of blood. Will education soften the rigors of this law? No; it intensifies them. The negro has progressed wonderfully—his relative position is much nearer the white man's standard of civilization now than thirty years ago, yet the fact is apparent that the races are farther apart than they were the day the negro was emancipated. The nearer the negro approaches to the white man's standard of civilization, the less love there is between them. Looking backward to the time when our black mammys were, in our esteem, second only to our mothers, and when we played in perfect harmony with the negro children, and contrasting it with the clearly defined relations that exist between the races to day, we readily see the difference.

A black man who has never committed a crime, who has always lived up to his highest ideals, who has cultivated his mind, whose moral character is roundly developed, who has been frugal and industrious, and has accumulated wealth, goes to a soda fountain to slake his thirst; he offers in exchange his money, but is refused for no other reason than that he is black and belongs to a different race. A man, in the land of his nativity, with the money to pay for the goods, can not, on account of race, buy the articles that are publicly offered for sale. This condition exists to-day, thirty years after the United States Constitution had proclaimed the civil and political equality of all of its citizens.

If we take the view that the negro will remain here indefinitely, then the only solution consistent with existence is entire subordination. If this be true, it is the greatest folly to educate him further than education may make him more efficient in the sphere which he must occupy. Viewed from this standpoint, he should be educated not with a purpose of lifting him to a higher plane, but to increase his power to do those things which would make him most useful to his masters. It should be an education of the hand rather than the head. This condition, however much freedom the race might nominally have, would be practically a mild form of slavery.

It may be true that there is an absence of that affiliation between the races that is necessary to political and industrial fusion, but it does not follow that the negro must be returned to slavery as the only solution of the question. If the races can not cooperate in promoting the ends of civilized life, they may be able, each acting independently in a measure, to direct their respective energies to a common purpose. I have no doubt, sir, that the negro is capable of improvement; that if given an opportunity he will ultimately become a helpful factor in society, capable of appropriating the benefits of free institutions and participating in their maintenance.

The race is yet only in the childhood of civilization. The prejudice against it now is largely due to its want of manly virtues. With time, education, and experience will come the rugged qualities of honesty, industry, frugality, which form the basis of true manhood, and these will appeal with irresistible force to the conscience and esteem of the whites. The development of those qualities will require time and patience, and it will be attended with sacrifices and embarrassments on the part of both races; but the dangers and embarrassments attending the policy of subjection will be infinitely greater.

I quote from a special dispatch from Raleigh, N. C., to the Washington Post, published recently, in relation to the introduction of bills in the pending legislature in that State upon the subject of negro education:

Three bills were introduced to amend the constitution so that school taxes paid by whites shall go entirely to white schools, those by negroes to negro schools. A law was once enacted of the same tenor, but the supreme court declared it unconstitutional.

Representative Thompson, when asked whether this bill had any backing,

replied: "There is in the rural districts, among white taxpayers, a great clamor against further education of negroes by whites. The people claim they have done enough for the negroes, and want to cut loose from them. They do not want negroes educated, as an educational qualification has been made, and if the negroes are educated this will amount to nothing."

Some leaders in the house declare the bill will never become a law.

The policy behind Mr. Thompson seems to be to keep the colored citizen in ignorance, so he will not be able to vote. He says, in effect, "What is the good in adopting an educational standard against the negro so he can not vote, and then educating him so he can comply with the law?" His education will destroy the purpose of the constitution.

I have said enough, Mr. Speaker, to warn the House and the country that the situation is rapidly crystallizing into a policy of complete subjugation of the colored race in all the fields of activity. Ignorance and illiteracy are necessary to the consummation of that policy, and slavery is its inevitable result. If that policy is to be acquiesced in, it is a confession that the civil war was a crime and emancipation a blunder.

POLITICS IN THE SOUTH.

I have been admonished that if the race question were let alone and the Constitution were ignored the "solid South" would go to pieces politically and a white Republican party would be built upon the ruins. A white Republican party in the South is only possible by universal assent to the practical enslavement of the negro. If that imaginary party should at any time show any friendship for the colored man or any sympathy with his struggles to better his condition, it would at once fall under the ban of the hereditary prejudices, and social and business proscription would be its fate.

If the country will consent that the 8,000,000 colored citizens shall be deprived of their rights, that lynchings may go on without let or hindrance as a necessary part of the process of subjugation, there may be a white Republican party in the South, but not otherwise.

But can we afford the price? A white Republican party! Shades of Lincoln and Seward, of Sumner and Chase! A white Republican party only a little over a generation after the death of the great emancipator! It is an impossibility. The Republican party is the party of human liberty and equal rights. It is based upon manhood and not upon race or color. The old Whig party forfeited its conscience and lost its character temporizing with wrong, injustice, and human oppression over half a century ago. The Republican party will never make that mistake. Let the South continue to be "solid" if it will, let the Republican party go down in defeat if it must, but it will never surrender the great principles of human liberty of which it was the born champion.

SECTIONALISM.

Whenever an attempt is made to consider any measure that affects the race question in the South, the unworthy cry of "sectionalism" is raised. I am only insisting upon the enforcement of the plain mandate of the Constitution, and for that I make no apology to any person or State. Is the Constitution sectional? Are human rights local? If they are, I am justly subject to the reproach of "sectionalism." Gentlemen who recently talked themselves into a frenzy of passion over fancied transgressions of the charter of government, ought to willingly assent to the enforcement of its plain provisions in their own States. Gentlemen who hysterically urged the intervention of the Government to protect an inferior race against tyranny and oppression in the distant islands of the sea, should not protest so vehemently upon the suggestion that an inferior race be accorded its plain constitutional rights at home.

But the question is not sectional. Every State in the Union is vitally interested in it. Inequality is injustice; therefore, it is unjust that one voter in Mississippi should exercise as much power in national affairs as four voters in New York; it is unjust that one vote in South Carolina should count for as much as ten votes in Indiana.

Besides this, each State is powerfully affected by the customs and institutions in every other State. Interference between the States must be free and unrestricted. Take the industrial situation, for instance. Under existing conditions the standard of living among the colored people of the South is low, and the rate of wages on the same basis. The colored laborer is completely at the mercy of the employer. He is unable to initiate and maintain labor organizations for the protection of his own interests.

In the State of South Carolina to-day there is a qualified condition of industrial serfdom. Farm laborers are compelled by the penal laws of the State to carry out their contracts of employment, however unjust and unfair they may be. They must perform all "the labor reasonably required" of them by the contract or go to jail. If anyone shall knowingly employ a laborer in any kind of service who is under contract of labor with another, he, too, is liable to fine and imprisonment, though the workman or his family may be on the verge of starvation. Can labor be independent and progressive where such laws exist? Could such laws exist in any State where labor has the freedom of the ballot?

In recent years a new impulse has been given to manufacturing industries in States where colored labor is abundant. With the natural resources and cheap tractable labor, the field is peculiarly inviting to capital. The employer is free from the annoyances that labor organizations sometimes give in other sections, and with simplified machinery and the coercive force of penal laws, the negro becomes as efficient a factory hand in many lines as the white man. Capital will continue to be attracted by such favorable conditions, and the products of cheap, servile toil will continue to be sold in competition with the products of intelligent, independent labor in other sections of the country. The strength and glory of our civilization abide in the comfortable but unpretentious homes of the independent wage-earners. Shall those homes be invaded by the blighting hand of servility? Shall intelligent labor be debased by such unjust and unholy competition?

Already cotton mills in New England have been compelled to reduce wages in order to compete with the cheap labor of Alabama and Georgia. Tariffs can not be imposed for protection, but colored labor must be educated and elevated. The negro must be given political power as fast as he can safely use it if his industrial independence is to be achieved. This is the only remedy. Have other States no interest in this question? Has organized labor no concern about it?

If the right of suffrage was taken from the white laborer, his independence would soon be lost and the legal safeguards for his protection would disappear from the statute books. Citizenship is an empty husk without the power to protect and enforce it, and that power is the ballot. The late Mr. Blaine truthfully said, respecting the negro:

Without the right of citizenship his freedom could be maintained only in name, and without the elective franchise his citizenship would have no legitimate and no authoritative protection.

No one questions the superiority of the white race, but that superiority is grounded in the rugged virtues of justice and humanity. It is surely no credit to American manhood to bind and shackle a helpless race to avoid the temporary embarrassments that would attend its proper development. Equal rights for all is the strongest sentiment in the American heart.

I rejoice at the evidences of a stronger bond of unity between all sections of the country; but the ties, if they are to be permanent, must be based upon everlasting principles of right. The Constitution is the measure of the rights and responsibilities of the States in their mutual relations, and all its essential provisions must be observed.

Let justice be supreme; give virtue the palm, whether it be in the white man or the black man. Pass suffrage laws as you will, but make them apply to all alike. Give the ebony-hued citizen the same opportunity in the struggles of life as the Anglo-Saxon and you will have appeased justice and satisfied the conscience of the American people. [Prolonged applause.]

Reapportionment Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. ANDREW F. FOX,

OF MISSISSIPPI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, January 5, 1901.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 12740) making an apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Twelfth Census—

Mr. FOX said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The bill the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] has presented proposes to reduce the representation in Congress of the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina three each on account of the disfranchisement of citizens by constitutions recently adopted, but does not reduce the representation in any other of the several States which, by their constitutions, impose similar restriction on the elective franchise.

The Washington Post in its issue of December 29, commenting on an editorial of the Indianapolis Sentinel in reference to the Crumpacker bill, said:

From all of which it appears that there will be both justice and common sense in voting down Representative CRUMPACKER'S bill; and that is just what is going to happen. As the Post has stated in previous discussions of this question, this nation is not going into the new century with a revival of sectional animosity; the second McKinley Administration is not going to be a new era of ill feeling between the North and the South. The South will not be further punished for the fateful mistake of the fifteenth amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the country on this assurance from so distinguished a journal, representing, as I know it does, the best

thought and opinion of our people of all parties. With this assurance I congratulate the country that the bitterness which characterizes the report of the gentleman from Indiana, and which has led him, perhaps unwittingly, to misrepresent the people of my own and other States is not shared or approved by the great political party of which he is a member. We of the South will be especially glad to realize the fulfillment of the Post's prophecies and to know that the time is coming when the two great political parties of the country will no longer be divided by sectional animosity, but only by honest differences as to governmental policies and a generous rivalry in developing our common country. I want to say in all sincerity that I am glad that I have at last lived to see a Republican Administration which is willing to let us alone and to trust our patriotism and our statesmanship to solve our own problems, which we are trying to do in good faith to both races and to the whole country.

The preservation of our civilization is to us paramount, and the South has remained solid for Democracy largely because Democracy in the South means opposition to the overthrow of that civilization.

Remove from us this nightmare, take away Federal interference in local affairs which constantly threatens us with a reign of ignorance and vice, and we will turn our backs upon the bitterness and mistakes of the past and devote ourselves to the consideration of great economic questions, the expansion of our commerce, the manufacture of all our raw materials, and the utilization of the great riches with which nature has blessed us more bounteously than any other quarter of the globe.

Mr. Speaker, the measure reported by the gentleman from Indiana is purely sectional and framed to secure political advantage, because, as I have said, it proposes to reduce the number of Representatives on account of the denial or abridgment of the right of suffrage only in four Southern States, when, as has just been shown by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUCK], the same conditions apply to many other of the States of the Union. The gentleman from Indiana in his report says:

Other States than those noted have restrictive qualifications upon manhood suffrage; but they are all of such a character and apply such conditions that it can not be said that in any particular State they directly and necessarily disfranchise a sufficient number of citizens to materially affect the basis of representation.

I hold in my hand a copy of the January number of the Forum, in which there is an able article contributed by Henry Gannett, chief geographer of the United States Geological Survey, on the new Congressional apportionment, in which he shows clearly that under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments the representation from Massachusetts should be reduced from 16 to 14 on account of the denial to certain classes of the right of suffrage. The franchise clause of the constitution of Massachusetts limits the right of suffrage to "every male citizen 21 years of age and upward, excepting paupers and persons under guardianship, who shall have resided within the county one year and within the town or district six months, and who shall have paid taxes assessed against him within two years next preceding an election."

By a subsequent amendment, adopted in 1857, the right of suffrage is further restricted by the following provision:

No person shall have the right to vote nor be eligible for office under the constitution of this Commonwealth who shall not be able to read the constitution in the English language and write his name.

It is well known that the Mississippi constitution is copied from the Massachusetts constitution so far as the electoral franchise is concerned, with the only difference that the Massachusetts constitution is more restrictive than the Mississippi constitution, because it denies the right of suffrage to paupers and other classes who can vote under the Mississippi constitution.

I want to show, Mr. Speaker, that there is almost as great a proportion of the number of male inhabitants over 21 years of age denied the right of suffrage in the State of Massachusetts as in the State of Mississippi. According to a State census of 1895, taken under the laws of Massachusetts, there were in that State 766,233 persons over 21 years of age liable to a poll tax, and who, under a rule of unrestricted manhood suffrage, would have been entitled to vote. Yet the total number of those who could qualify themselves to vote in Massachusetts in 1895 was only 560,892. Much has been said in the report of the gentleman from Indiana, and by other gentlemen on this floor, as to the small number who actually vote at elections in the State of Mississippi.

I have taken the trouble to ascertain the number of votes cast in each Congressional district of Massachusetts in the election of 1900, and I have found that in the 13 Congressional districts of that State there were only 284,783 votes cast; but little over one-half of those who could qualify themselves to vote. By the same argument that is used by the gentleman from Indiana, that everybody who does not vote is disfranchised and not allowed to vote, there are proportionally more voters in the State of Massachusetts who are disfranchised than in the State of Mississippi; that is, about two-thirds of the number who pay poll tax.

In this connection I want to call attention of the House to the

fact that while it is true that there is a small number of votes cast in a general election in Mississippi, it is because there is no division along party lines in that State and nominations are generally settled by primary election; so that the way to ascertain the number of legal voters in Mississippi is not to take the number of votes cast in a general election, but to take the number registered and those who vote at primary elections. In my own Congressional district there were 24,935 registered voters in 1899; in the entire State of Mississippi, 140,984 registered voters. These figures are taken from the report of the secretary of state.

Mr. SIMS. May I ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question?

Mr. FOX. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. Is there any attempt of any kind in Mississippi to prevent those who are qualified to vote under the laws of Mississippi from voting?

Mr. FOX. I am very glad the gentleman has asked that question, because the gentleman from Indiana charges in his report that there is a general denial of the right to vote to qualified colored voters in the Southern States. I challenge the statement. He should not make so grave a charge without proof of the fact. I challenge him to show to this House that since the adoption of the constitution of Mississippi, in 1890, there has ever been a single registered qualified voter denied the right to cast his vote freely and as he wished. Such a thing has never occurred. There is no State in this Union in which the right of suffrage is exercised more freely, so far as registered voters are concerned, than in the State of Mississippi.

Mr. GAINES. By all who have the legal right to vote?

Mr. FOX. Yes, sir.

But, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana, in speaking of lynchings and other crimes in the State of Mississippi and other States, says that—

These atrocities bespeak a deplorable condition of political morals; that their frequent occurrence is the legitimate result of a generation of disregard of election laws.

Sir, we have lawlessness in the State of Mississippi, I am sorry to say, as they have in the State of Indiana; but I challenge the gentleman to the proof that any lawlessness in Mississippi is the result of the condition of political morals, or that it is a legitimate result of the disregard of election laws. Allow me to read what the Washington Post says in reference to this charge of the gentleman from Indiana:

We regret Mr. CRUMPACKER's action in the matter of reducing representation in the Southern States, especially his plea that the reduction will be warranted on the score of lynchings. Surely this is an issue that Indiana can not afford to broach. There have been more lynchings in Indiana within the past few years than in any Southern State, and as for the outrages committed by the "White Caps"—the whippings, the burnings, etc.—surely Mr. CRUMPACKER's State occupies an easy prominence.

Only a few days ago a mob in Indiana battered down the wall of a jail, took from their cells three negro prisoners charged with murder, hung them in the jail yard, and riddled their bodies with bullets. Mr. Speaker, I am not here to make charges against the State of Indiana. I dislike to admit the fact—I am sorry to say it is a fact—that there is lawlessness anywhere in the United States, but it is true and always will be true. I wish to ask the gentleman, if it is true that whatever lawlessness there is in Mississippi is due to a low state of political morals and a disregard of election laws, is it not equally true in the State of Indiana that the lawlessness, which is greater there than in any Southern State, according to the Post, is due to the low state of political morals and disregard of election laws?

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, so far as lynchings for rape are concerned, they are not due to a disregard of law, but to the resentment that manhood will always feel toward crimes against womanhood. Lynching is much to be deplored, but the only way to stop it is to stop the crime of criminal assault upon woman. As long as that continues, whether the guilty man is white or black, he will be lynched. Lynching for these crimes is not caused by any race prejudice, but is a result of the deep resentment against the offense, and our people are as quick to resent it against a white man as against a negro. There is no section of the United States where there exists manhood and respect for womanhood where these crimes will not be resented.

As was stated on one occasion by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], under the very same condition that a lynching would occur in Mississippi it would be pulled off on Boston Commons. If the Southern people are quicker and more violent in their summary punishment of such outlaws, it is because in no quarter of the globe is there greater reverence for pure womanhood. They idealize and idolize women. When a girl baby is born she is the queen of the household, before whom every knee bends. Father, mother, and brother are her willing subjects. Every sacrifice is made for her comfort, her education, and her refinement, and when she buds into womanhood it is not only the courtier, cultivated in all the graces of gallantry, who shows her honor, but every son of toil doffs his hat to her, if

not with the grace of a plumed knight, certainly with a loyal heart and ready hand that she can always command, whether it be to hold the plow or pull the trigger.

The truth should be known. Apologists sometimes make the statement that lynching is caused by the law's delay and the uncertainty of punishment by the courts. In my judgment, for the crime of rape, anyone, white or black, of high or low station, would be lynched in the South if there were absolute certainty that the criminal would be tried, convicted, and executed the next day. In my judgment, the main reason for this, which, strange to say, so far as I know, has never been mentioned in the public prints, is the fact that everyone revolts at the idea of placing on the witness stand a refined woman and compelling her to go through the harrowing and disgusting details of so horrible a crime. Such a punishment to a good woman would be more cruel and inhuman than lynching one who has placed himself beyond the pale of law and forfeited his right to protection under any law, human or Divine. Another thing should be well understood, that our people will never be influenced by those who are continually howling against the crime of the lyncher and have no abhorrence for the hellish crime of the lynched and no sympathy for his victim.

Mr. Speaker, in 1899 the New York Herald sent to the State of Georgia one of its most distinguished representatives, the senior member of its staff, Dr. George H. Hepworth, as a special commissioner to investigate the crime of lynching in the South. He made a report to his journal of his observations and the conclusions to which he arrived after making a thorough investigation with reference to these crimes in the South. I commend to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] what Dr. Hepworth says:

We shall be greatly puzzled unless we can fully grasp the situation, which is very different from anything to be found in the North. And we shall not only misunderstand the Georgians, but give them discredit for motives which they do not entertain. I am not at all sure, however, that we should ourselves pursue any other course under the same circumstances. The cry which made the welkin ring was, "We must protect our wives and our daughters," and that is the key to the problem. If my wife, or mother, or sister, had been outraged by a doubled-dyed villain I could not tell you what I would or would not do. When the matter is brought home to yourself you recognize its horror. There are no lengths to which you would not go in the way of punishment. It is easy to condemn a thousand miles away, but hard to condemn when on the spot with a like fate staring you in the face. I neither plead nor excuse; I simply say that I also am human.

Ninety-five per cent of the negroes have the entire confidence of their employers. They are respected because they are law-abiding citizens. They have property interests of their own to guard, and a man who has a few hundred dollars at stake is a conservative. But the 5 per cent of fellows, who are not only ignorant, but vicious, who know no restraint and will commit any crime without compunction, have ample opportunity to perpetrate deeds of daring devilry, and, as at present constituted, the people of the region are powerless to protect themselves and live in the continual consciousness of insecurity. They are nervous, irritable, and timid. A woman dares not trust herself at any distance from her home after dark. With nine men out of ten whom she may meet she will be as safe as at her own fireside. It is the unknown tenth whom she evades. We can hardly conceive of this state of affairs, but it is the actual condition in many counties in this State and in other States of the South.

It would be an impertinence for me to name a remedy. The country has the most perfect confidence in the South. We neither impeach your motives nor charge you with unwisdom. You are to the manner born, and quite able to handle all public questions; better able to do so than we of the North are to make suggestions. To merely find fault with existing conditions is the task of self-conceit or fanaticism, and I don't think I have more than the average amount of either quality.

Mr. Speaker, I want especially to emphasize what Dr. Hepworth says, that 95 per cent of the negroes have the entire confidence of their employers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I want very much to make a full statement as to the political and social conditions in Mississippi, and I ask—

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have permission to conclude his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman have leave to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOX. I thank the House. I did not intend to trespass further upon the time of the House and was only going to ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, but I will continue for a few minutes.

I say I want especially to emphasize the fact that 95 per cent of the negroes have the entire confidence of their employers. This is true in every section of the South. In Mississippi especially the relations between the two races could not be more friendly or more satisfactory to both. The truth is that since the adoption of the constitution of 1890 in the State of Mississippi there has been no race question in the State; it has been solved. There was a race question before that time. There was, rather, a question as to which should rule—the intelligence and virtue of the State, or the ignorance and vice of the State. It is a fact that from 1865 to 1875 the State was dominated and plundered, not by the negroes, but by their vicious leaders, who pandered

to their prejudices and controlled their votes. The condition of things is correctly described by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] in his report, in which he says:

The insurrectionary States were restored to their constitutional relations with the National Government upon the adoption of constitutions that granted suffrage to all citizens. Legislation was enacted by Congress providing that the qualifications of voters contained in the constitutions of those States should never be changed. By these provisions about a million men, largely unfitted for the responsibilities of suffrage, were given the ballot, and it is no reflection upon them to say that in a large degree they became the helpless tools of demagogues and political intriguers, and in most of the Southern States was inaugurated a reign of political corruption and misgovernment that constitutes one of the most shameful pages in the history of the States.

Men of the South, men of intelligence and character who had at heart the welfare of their States, looked with dismay upon the wreck and ruin to their institutions that was being perpetrated by this irresponsible flood of ignorance and illiteracy. As might have been expected, there was reaction, and intelligent citizens set about to devise some method of checking this saturation of political corruption and mismanagement. They felt justified in adopting methods for the protection of their affairs that were condemned by the people of other sections of the country.

It was in order to avoid these conditions and save ourselves from their degrading and demoralizing influences that the constitution of 1890 was adopted, disfranchising illiterates, those who fail to pay their taxes, and criminals, just as has been done in the State of Massachusetts. The framing of that constitution, solving as it did the great race problem in a manner satisfactory to both races, was the greatest achievement of modern statesmanship; and for its adoption Mississippi should have the approbation and not the condemnation of every patriotic American citizen. Since the adoption of that constitution no State in this Union has been characterized by a better observance of law and order than the State of Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I live in a small town of something like 4,000 inhabitants. One-half the population of that town are negroes. In the county in which I reside there are three times as many negroes as whites, and the proportion is about the same in many other counties of my Congressional district. During the seventeen years that I have resided in the town of Westpoint, Miss., there has never been a negro killed or, so far as I know, even assaulted by a white man in that town. Three negroes have been killed there by negroes, one white man by a negro, and one white man by a white man. These are the only homicides that have occurred in that town in seventeen years. Since 1890 there has not, to my knowledge, been any crime or violence caused by race antagonism or race prejudice in my Congressional district. No kinder relations could possibly exist anywhere between employer and employee than exists in the State of Mississippi between the white man and negro laborer.

Much has been said here by the gentleman from Indiana as to the educational conditions in the State of Mississippi. He says:

It is claimed that as long as the negro has political rights he will have ambitions for political preferment and thus become a disturbing factor in society, and the right of suffrage should be withheld for the purpose of extinguishing hope of advancement. But the social and industrial proscription is as unrelenting and implacable as the political. With his advancement in intelligence the negro will have aspirations to advance socially and industrially, and still he will be a "thorn in the flesh" to his supersensitive white brother. In order to make the dominion of the white man complete all opportunity for education must be taken from the negro. This is the inevitable tendency of the present régime and the necessary result of the logic of absolute disfranchisement.

I am sorry that the gentleman from Indiana did not inform himself more correctly as to the state of affairs in Mississippi. In the public schools of Mississippi there are more colored children enrolled than white. They have exactly the same facilities, both in the common schools and in the colleges, as the whites. They attend for the same length of time and have the same privileges.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. FOX. Yes.

Mr. GAINES. How much taxes do they pay?

Mr. FOX. I am very glad you asked that question. The whites, of course, pay almost all the taxes. A large majority of negroes are liable for nothing but poll tax, and the payment of that is not compulsory. The statement is made in the report of the gentleman from Indiana of the amount expended in Mississippi, which he says is 81 cents per capita. He has been misled. I have a recent report of the superintendent of education for the State of Mississippi giving the data, which I will insert in the RECORD. Instead of 81 cents per capita, it is over \$2. Over 25 per cent of the population of Mississippi is enrolled in the public schools, while only 16 per cent of the population of Massachusetts is so enrolled. While they pay a much larger tax per capita for public schools in Massachusetts than in Mississippi, we pay a greater ad valorem tax—that is, we pay more in proportion to the assessed valuation of our taxable property than they do in Massachusetts.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. FOX. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. You say you have a report of the commissioner of education of Mississippi, giving the school tax per capita at over \$2?

Mr. FOX. Yes, sir. I will insert the data in my remarks.

Mr. MANN. Does that apply to the public-school system?

Mr. FOX. I will explain how it does apply. One million dollars are levied for common schools by the State. My colleague [Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi] will correct me if I make a mistake. In addition to that, each county levies a tax, where it is necessary, to carry on the schools for the required term.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. And I will also state that there is also \$272,534 for the colleges, white and colored.

Mr. FOX. And the colored have the same collegiate advantages as the white children, as well as the same common-school advantages. Then there is the Chickasaw school fund, amounting to \$52,733.47. In addition, we have in the cities and towns—and I hope I have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois—

Mr. MANN. You have.

Mr. FOX. We have in all the cities and towns of the State what we call separate school districts, in which there is a sum levied by the municipality, in addition to the sums levied by the State and by the county, for the purpose of maintaining the schools ten months instead of five months in the year. This levy and also the cost of school buildings in the separate districts are not embraced in the report of the commissioner of education.

There is no State in the Union in which the cities and towns have better public schoolhouses. In every instance they are built, not by public taxation levied by the State or by the counties, but by the municipalities, and are never reported. In the State of Massachusetts and other States the reports include not only the salaries of teachers and every current expense, but also the cost of school buildings. They were not included, so far as the separate school districts are concerned, in the report of the superintendent of education for Mississippi. Most schoolhouses used for public-school purposes, even in the country, are built by private subscription and never reported.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me—and this is a very important subject—I do not know how far the report of the Commissioner of Education is correct, and for that reason I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the report of the Commissioner of Education for 1896 and 1897—the last report of the Commissioner of Education of the United States—gives 15 cents for each pupil for building purposes in Mississippi; so that it does purport to give the amount spent in the State for building purposes. The total expenditures for school purposes, for salaries, and for all other purposes in the State of Mississippi is given for 1896-97 at \$1,165,845. Now I shall be very glad indeed if the gentleman from Mississippi will show to us that this report is entirely inaccurate, and that the State of Mississippi, instead of paying over 81 cents, is paying over \$2 per capita.

Mr. FOX. I do not say that it is inaccurate so far as it goes, but I say that it has no reference to the town schoolhouses. I repeat, there is no report embracing the cost of the schoolhouses in the separate town districts. Take my own town, for instance. The public schoolhouse in Westpoint was built at a cost of something like \$20,000 by a tax levied by the municipality. It is not embraced in any report, and—

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, the report of the commissioner of education purports to give the cost of that.

Mr. FOX. It is not correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If the gentleman will pardon me, the State tax of Mississippi is the amount given there, and in addition to that each municipality levies a school tax.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Mississippi will permit me, I will state that this is the case in every other State of the Union, and this report of the Commissioner of Education purports to give it as to Mississippi.

Mr. FOX. It is not accurate.

Mr. MANN. I will ask if the gentleman will give us the figures with reference to the State of Mississippi.

Mr. FOX. I can not give the gentleman from Illinois the figures as to the cost of the schoolhouses in each of the cities, because, I say, it is not embraced in any report.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi tell me that they keep a commissioner of education in the State of Mississippi, and that having such an officer they do not keep any record of the amount spent in building schools by the county?

Mr. FOX. It is not the business of the superintendent of education to report to the legislature what the city of Westpoint has done in the matter of erecting schoolhouses at her own cost and on her own account.

Mr. MANN. He does not so report?

Mr. FOX. He does not so report.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, so far as the process of taxing for school buildings and raising money for school purposes is concerned, the same process exists in all the States practically. The State makes an appropriation for a certain amount, cities make appropriations, and school districts make appropriations, and the report of the Commissioner of Education for the country purports to cover all these expenditures. In the State of Illinois, which is reported as having expended \$17,000,000,

that does not mean that the State raises that amount by taxation, but it includes the city taxes and local taxes.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. We have no building fund in Mississippi. We build our schoolhouses by private subscription. We built one several years ago in my town by taxation on the town.

Mr. MANN. They report a public-building fund in the State of Mississippi, so I think the gentleman must be mistaken.

Mr. FOX. Well, the gentleman will have to accept my statement or reject it. If he will not accept it, I can not help it.

Mr. MANN. What I want is the gentleman's figures.

Mr. FOX. I have not compiled them, but I will insert them in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I thought the gentleman had them before him.

Mr. FOX. No; I have not. I say, so far as the cost of schoolhouses is concerned, only the expenditure for certain public schoolhouses in the country levied by the legislature or by the county is reported; and there is not included in any report the cost of schoolhouses in separate school districts, which is by far the larger amount.

I find from the report of the State superintendent referred to that for the fiscal year of 1898-99 the receipts for public education, exclusive of separate districts, were \$1,195,877.48. For the year 1900 the legislature in the State appropriated the following amounts:

For public education in common schools.....	\$1,000,000.00
Poll tax.....	300,000.00
For improvements in the university.....	34,000.00
Textile school at A. and M. College.....	40,000.00
For the A. and M. College.....	31,019.28
For the Industrial Institute and College.....	91,031.00
For the Alcorn College (colored).....	47,034.50
For Holly Springs State Normal College.....	4,500.00
Interest on the Chickasaw school fund.....	52,733.47
Interest on agricultural-scrip fund.....	12,729.00
Interest on seminary fund.....	32,643.67

Total..... 1,645,690.92

In this no account is taken of the extra levies made by the cities and towns for the purpose of carrying on the schools nine months instead of five months each year, nor for the levies made for building schoolhouses. It is safe to say that the school buildings erected by the cities and towns and those erected in the country by private subscription cost not less than \$1,000,000.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. FOX. Yes.

Mr. TOMPKINS. I understood the gentleman from Mississippi to say that in his Congressional district there were three colored men to every white man.

Mr. FOX. No; I said in my county.

Mr. TOMPKINS. I understood the gentleman to say that it was true of the whole district.

Mr. FOX. If I did I will modify that and say that it is so in most of the counties. In some counties there is a larger proportion.

Mr. TOMPKINS. What is the entire population of the gentleman's district?

Mr. FOX. Under the last census it is 238,864.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Will the gentleman tell us what proportion of colored men entitled to vote actually do vote in his district?

Mr. FOX. I will tell you how many have qualified and registered. In the Fourth Congressional district there are 24,935 registered voters, of which 3,331 are colored voters. I might say that this is about the average number of votes cast in each Congressional district of Massachusetts.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Will the gentleman kindly tell us what the total vote for a member of Congress in his district was last year? Was it not about 3,500?

Mr. FOX. No, sir; about 10,000. It is given in the report of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. TOMPKINS. The Congressional Directory says 3,431.

Mr. FOX. That was the vote cast in 1898.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Will the gentleman tell us what the vote was in his district in 1900?

Mr. FOX. It is given in the report of the gentleman from Indiana. I will read from that. You will find it on page 126. In my district, according to the report of the gentleman from Indiana, there were 9,552 votes cast.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Out of a registry of 24,000?

Mr. FOX. Yes. I will explain how that is. Nominations are made by primary election, and they settle the contest, so that little interest is taken in the general election. I am glad to say that we have very few Republicans in the Fourth Congressional district of Mississippi. [Laughter.] I read further from the report of the gentleman from Indiana. He says:

It is highly probable that a fair educational law, justly administered, would be attended with great advantages to both races. If that kind of law were enacted, applicable to all alike, and if it were administered so that the colored man would know that when he complied with the law he would be accorded his privileges, there would be a constant motive for him to improve his condition.

I am glad the gentleman from Indiana made that admission. His statement exactly describes the condition of things in Mississippi.

As I have already explained, the educational law is fairly administered in that State. Whether the law satisfies the gentleman from Indiana or not, the blacks in that State have exactly the same school facilities as the whites. In 1899 there were 167,178 white children and 192,368 black children in the public schools. We pay as much for the public education of white and colored population as does any other State, in proportion to our ability. If there is any crime in not paying more, it is the crime of poverty. It is not because we are unwilling to pay. The gentleman from Indiana intimates that the negro in the Southern States is not treated fairly; that when he has qualified himself to vote he is not allowed to vote. The reverse is true. Since the adoption of the constitution of 1890 in Mississippi no man has ever been denied the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition. There has never been anybody disfranchised, either by the terms of the law or by its administration, except for crime, for illiteracy, or for other reasons specified in the constitution.

Mr. GAINES. I would like to interrupt the gentleman for a moment.

Mr. FOX. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES. In speaking of the constitutions of the different States, allow me to say that the State of Wyoming has a constitution patterned after that of the State of Massachusetts, which provides as follows:

Article 6, section 2. No person shall have the right to vote who shall not be able to read the constitution of this State.

Now, sir, the supreme court of Wyoming, in the case of *Rasmussen vs. Baker* (50 Pacific Reporter, 821), held that no person is to be regarded as able to read the constitution who can not read it in the English language. In a certain case the constitution was translated into the Finnish language, and as translated the Finns read it, and having complied with that test they voted. A contest arose upon the question, and the case that I have just cited settled that the vote was not a legal vote.

Mr. FOX. So far as that is concerned—

Mr. MONDELL. I would like to make a brief statement in reply to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. FOX. I can not yield for further interruption.

Mr. MONDELL. I simply wish to make an explanation of this matter.

Mr. FOX. I am trespassing upon the time of the House and I can not yield further.

So far as this question is concerned, whatever objection the gentleman from Indiana may find to the constitution of the State of Mississippi, the Supreme Court of the United States has found no objection to it. The suffrage provisions of our constitution were passed upon by that court in the case of *Williams vs. The State of Mississippi*. In that case no question was involved except the validity of the constitutional provision of the State of Mississippi on the subject of elective franchise. Every lawyer is familiar with that case, in which the Supreme Court held that there is nothing in the constitution of the State of Mississippi in violation of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

The gentleman from Indiana says:

Under existing conditions the prejudice against color is so intense that by subterfuge and administrative jugglery the negro is usually denied the right to vote when he earns it, and there is little inducement for him to prepare himself.

This statement is news to me and to every Representative from Mississippi in this House. I would not at all hesitate to say that I would resign my seat in this Congress if this fact could be established. I challenge the gentleman from Indiana to establish it. The statement is not true as a matter of fact. It is a libel on the good name of the State. There has never been even a complaint in the State of Mississippi by a negro that he was denied the right of suffrage when he had earned it under the constitution of the State.

It was to escape the deplorable condition of affairs that existed before 1890 that we fell into line with Massachusetts, Connecticut, and other great States and adopted an educational qualification. As to the "understanding clause" of our constitution, which has been criticised so much, it is an enlargement and not a restriction of the right of suffrage. It is a curious fact that more colored men than white men have registered and qualified themselves to vote in the State of Mississippi under the "understanding clause." As a rule the white illiterate has too much pride to expose his illiteracy, and only in rare instances does a white man ever apply for registration under the understanding clause. In my own county I have never known a solitary instance of that kind. Indeed, I do not recollect that I ever knew of such a case in the State of Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If my colleague will allow me, I would like to reinforce his argument by saying that there has never come to my knowledge a single instance of a white man

making application for registration and the right to vote under the "understanding clause." If there has been such a case I have never heard of it. I have heard of a few negroes who have qualified under that clause.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have not the floor; but if my colleague will yield, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. FOX. I will yield for a question.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Does the gentleman know of a single white man in his State having been refused registration who applied for it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes; a great many white men have been refused registration and the right to vote—some upon the ground that they have not paid their poll tax, and some upon the ground that they have not qualified under the educational clause of the constitution. There has been a great deal of carelessness, and a great many people, white and black both, have been allowed to register without a proper examination as to whether they were educationally qualified.

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I have trespassed too far upon the time of the House, and I shall close by reading from an address made by a distinguished Senator from Massachusetts in the city of Charleston, December 22, 1899. I commend it to this House with perfect confidence that the great majority of Republican members here agree with Senator HOAR. And I want especially to commend to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] what the Senator has said of lawlessness in the South after a full investigation of the subject. I want to commend the spirit with which the Senator treats this question, void of any sectional animosity or feeling and void of any partisanship. He said in part:

In our part of the country we have to deal with the great problems of the strife between labor and capital, and of the government of cities where vast masses of men born on foreign soil, of different nationalities and of different races, strangers to American principles, to American ideas, to American history, are gathered together to exercise the unaccustomed function of self-government in an almost unrestricted liberty. You have to deal with a race problem rendered more difficult still by a still larger difference in the physical and intellectual qualities of the two races whom Providence has brought together.

I should be false to my own manhood if I failed to express my profound regret and sorrow for some occurrences that have taken place recently, both in the North and in the South. I am bound to say that, considering all the circumstances, the North has been the worse offender.

The time has already come when throughout large spaces in our country both races are dwelling together in peace and harmony. I believe that condition of things to be the rule in the South, and not to be the exception. We have the right to claim that the country and the South be judged by the rule and not by the exception.

But we want you to stand by us in our troubles as brethren and as countrymen. We shall have to look, in many perils that are before us in the near future, to the conservatism and wisdom of the South. And if the time shall come when you think we can help you, your draft shall be fully honored.

[Applause.]

Reapportionment Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. MARRIOTT BROSIUS,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, January 5, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 12740) making an apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Twelfth Census.

Mr. BROSIUS said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Eight years ago I introduced a joint resolution to amend the Constitution so as to limit the membership of the House to 350. In the present session I introduced a similar resolution. I have long been convinced of the wisdom of this limitation, and this is my apology for inflicting some observations upon the House this morning.

I listened with much interest to the notable address of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] on Saturday morning. When that gentleman makes a speech in this House it is a public event of importance, and no apology is needed for giving it some attention. It is my singular good fortune to agree with one proposition in all that part of my honorable friend's speech which related to the bill, and that is that the pending measure is one of the most important that can engage the attention of the House.

The importance of it is so transcendent that the gentleman, with all his amplitude of understanding, does not fully appreciate and is not entirely sensible of its far-reaching consequences. The evidence of this is found in the tenor of his speech, which was primarily an appeal for justice to the State of Maine and for fairness and equity in the action of the House. No injustice can be done the State of Maine or any other State by this bill. It is an entire misconception of the effect of the operation of the measure that

leads to the suggestion of injustice. That word expresses the deprivation of some right, public or private, which ought to be enjoyed. A farmer might with as much propriety accuse the Almighty of injustice for not making his farm as fertile as his neighbor's.

The effect of this measure upon the State of Maine and other States is a scientific result. It results from the inevitable operation of the laws of mathematical science. It is the decree of arithmetic—the inexorable logic of figures. To call such a result injustice is an outrage on the dictionary as well as a mutilation of logic. That the State of Maine has not increased in population in the last ten years is a fact which could only wound a supersensitive nature. Yet the gentleman from Maine, with extreme ardor, which may or may not indicate sincerity of conviction, rallies to the defense of his State against the supposed reproach which that fact casts upon her as if it was a matter involving moral turpitude or a breach of honor on the part of his State.

He must himself realize, as everybody else does, that from that fact, though reflecting no discredit upon the State, there results an imperious necessity for either diminishing Maine's representation or increasing that of States which have increased in population; for the Constitution requires representation to be apportioned according to their respective numbers. It does not modify the situation or mitigate its effects to suggest that Maine has sent her citizens to other States, for the Constitution does not permit the representation from the State of Maine to be based upon those who, for motives of prudence or prosperity, have left the State, but upon those only who remain, whether to avail themselves of the superior opportunities that State affords, or whether they think it a good State to die in, because they can leave it at last with so little reluctance. As well might I claim an additional member for Pennsylvania because that State gave the State of Maine the greatest citizen she ever had, whose luminous intellect and exalted character shed upon his adopted State an undying luster.

It would not be much out of place to observe here that the protracted colloquy between the distinguished gentlemen from Maine and Illinois this morning is an illustration of the evils which are promoted by undue numbers in a legislative body. But for vices of behavior and decorum into which we have fallen by the encouragement of numbers that colloquy would not have occurred.

The chief merit of the minority bill which was advocated by the gentleman from Maine is that it increases the delegations from nearly half the States and prevents a loss to any. That suggestion may appeal, and may have been intended to appeal, to the State pride of the States which gained as well as those which did not lose Representatives, but it does not rise to the dignity of argument, for it is totally irrelevant to the question to be determined, which is, what is the most suitable number of members to constitute an effective working body.

If gentlemen believe that it is an end in itself important to be secured that each State shall have at least its present representation, that end will continue important in the future and the House must continue increasing its membership as long as population increases in any State. How anyone in a lucid interval can entertain such a proposition I can not understand. It is an end which Congress has not heretofore regarded as important and has not observed except in three instances in all our history. In 8 out of 11 apportionments in our history one or more States suffered a loss of representation.

In the first apportionment Georgia lost 1. In the fourth, Connecticut lost 1; Delaware, 1; Massachusetts, 7; Vermont, 1, and Virginia, 1; 11 in all. In the fifth, Maryland lost 1; Massachusetts, 1; New Hampshire, 1; Virginia, 1; 4 in all. In the sixth, Connecticut lost 2; Georgia, 1; Kentucky, 3; Maine, 1; Maryland, 2; Massachusetts, 2; New Hampshire, 1; New Jersey, 1; New York, 6; North Carolina, 4; South Carolina, 2; Tennessee, 2; Vermont, 1; Virginia, 6; in all, 38. In the seventh, Maine lost 1; New Hampshire, 1; New York, 1; North Carolina, 1; South Carolina, 1; Tennessee, 1; Vermont, 1; Virginia, 2; in all, 9. In the eighth, Alabama lost 1; Georgia, 1; Kentucky, 1; Maine, 1; Maryland, 1; New York, 2; Pennsylvania, 1; South Carolina, 2; Tennessee, 2; Virginia, 2; in all, 17. In the ninth, New Hampshire lost 1; Vermont, 1; Virginia, 2; in all, 4. In the tenth, Maine lost 1. The aggregate loss of members in all the apportionments from the beginning is 85, and singularly enough the State of Maine sustained the loss of one member in each of the sixth, seventh, eighth, and tenth apportionments.

Now it is proposed that the almost unbroken practice of Congress for a hundred years is to be reversed, and we are asked to adopt the principle that a State should never have its representation diminished.

Later in his address the gentleman from Maine reached the fundamental contention and declared that the House ought to increase its membership as population increases. On this proposition I join issue with him. I insist that there should be a stop to the growth of this House right here and now. The increase of our membership may be a good thing, but only to a limited extent. The limit,

in my judgment, has been reached, and we ought to stop. I do not know that I can better accentuate the importance of this than by introducing a humorous situation in a family which I somewhere heard of.

An Irishman made a contract with his wife that when the children came singly she should name them and when they came in pairs he should enjoy that prerogative. At length there came a pair of girls. The father said: "Under our arrangement it falls to me to name these girls, and I will name one Kate; and as they look a good deal alike, I will name the other Duplicate." After the lapse of time there came a pair of boys. The father said: "I will name one of these boys Peter; and as I vote in New York, I will name the other Repeater." Fate was kind to the family, and after a time another pair of boys came. The father looked serious and said: "Mother, this seems like a good deal of a good thing. I will name one of these boys Max and the other Climax, and this thing has got to stop right here." Mr. Speaker, we have reached the climax in the size of this House, and I would stop right here.

THE SITUATION.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to bring the existing situation into distinct view it may be stated that the only limitations upon the power of Congress to regulate the number of the House of Representatives are that it shall not exceed 1 for every 30,000 inhabitants, and that each State shall have at least 1 member. These restrictions are a distinct concession to the principle of constitutional limitation, and they had for their object the prevention of a too numerous and unwieldy House. There was no fear that it would be too small for effective legislation. Story, in his Commentaries, says:

The danger was that from the national impulses of the popular will and the desire of ambitious candidates to attain offices the number would be soon swollen to an unreasonable size, so that it would at once generate and combine factions, obstruct deliberation, introduce and perpetuate turbulent and rash counsels.

There are those who believe that we are already perilously near the edge of this condition. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is easily seen that it would be no infraction of the Constitution to make the ratio so large that no State could elect more than 1 Representative. In that event the House would now consist of 45 members. It would, on the other hand, be equally free from constitutional objection to make the ratio 30,000. This would give us a House of over 2,500 members. Between these extremes the pendulum of Congressional power swings.

In the exercise of such a power we can not be too conservative. Wisdom enjoins us to stoutly resist the tendency to increase the membership of the House. The following table shows how steadily, with a single break, the number has increased from the beginning:

Census.	Ratio.	Whole number of Representatives.
Constitution, 1789.....	30,000	65
First Census, 1793.....	33,000	105
Second Census, 1803.....	33,000	141
Third Census, 1813.....	35,000	181
Fourth Census, 1823.....	40,000	213
Fifth Census, 1833.....	47,700	240
Sixth Census, 1843.....	70,680	223
Seventh Census, 1853.....	93,423	234
Eighth Census, 1863.....	127,381	243
Ninth Census, 1873.....	151,425	253
Tenth Census, 1883.....	151,911	325
Eleventh Census, 1893.....	173,901	356

But it was further illustrated in the debate on the apportionment bill ten years ago. The chief end which the Committee on the Census set before them and which they seemed most proud of achieving, because it reconciled all minds, was to find a number which would prevent a loss to any State without unreasonably swelling the aggregate membership. The temptation to keep intact the delegations of the States whose population is stable is hard to resist. It will be no easier in the future than now. The virtue of an average member of Congress will be found not quite equal to the task of resisting the solicitations of State pride to maintain the numerical integrity of his delegation. If he is a man of heroic mold and can rise superior to such considerations, he may still encounter a situation quite too much for him in the fact that his own seat is in peril.

Who is fit to legislate upon the right to retain his own seat in Congress? Under the stress of such a situation how much easier it would be to give your adhesion to a place than to a principle. That the tenure of one's office depending upon his conclusions on a public question is not calculated to promote a wise decision goes without saying. Situations which invite such conflicts in the arena of legislation between private interest and public duty ought to be avoided whenever possible.

The character of the opposition to this bill still further exemplifies what all experience confirms. We witness the members from the States which will lose a member under the operation of this measure in solid array against it, with few exceptions. They

organized the opposition that is being made to the bill. For some days prior to the beginning of this debate the newspapers have informed us of the combination that was being formed by the States that will lose a member to defeat the bill. The following, from a Washington correspondent to the Philadelphia Press, I have no doubt is authentic:

[Special dispatch to the Press.]

WASHINGTON, December 26.

Some of the opponents of the Hopkins reapportionment bill, who have been trying to ascertain the prevailing opinion in the House of Representatives on the subject, assert that there is not the least doubt that the bill will be defeated. Representatives LANDIS, of Indiana; CURTIS, of Kansas; BURLEIGH, of Maine; MERCER, of Nebraska, and others are quoted as expressing that opinion. On the other hand, Mr. HOPKINS is very confident of the passage of the measure.

All of the States that will lose a member under the Hopkins bill, with the exception of Ohio, are perfecting an organization, or claim to have accomplished one already, with a view of defeating the bill. Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Nebraska, South Carolina, and Virginia are the most active in the opposition to the bill, which provides for retaining the House with its present number of members.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is too obvious to need to be mentioned that the time will come when States of stable populations must have their delegations in Congress diminished more or less to avoid the calamity of a House too unwieldy to do business. Why not recognize the inevitable now and avert the evil of undue numbers? If State pride is to be wounded sooner or later it would be patriotic to bare your breasts and receive the wound now for the good of the country. A State may be excused for desiring to maintain its standing in the family of Commonwealths, but it can not expect to stand still and hold its rank with States that are marching on. This a popular body, whose representative power is based on population. States of stable population must decrease their delegations in Congress, or States of growing population must increase theirs. In either case the relative political power of the States would remain the same.

Under this bill the "ratio" will be 208,868—with an additional member to those States which, after being divided by the "ratio," have a fraction of population left of more than half the "ratio." The result will be that in 30 States the representation will remain unchanged. In the remaining 15 States 7 would gain and 8 lose representation. The gains and losses would be as follows:

GAINS.	
Illinois.....	1
Louisiana.....	1
Minnesota.....	1
New Jersey.....	1
New York.....	1
Texas.....	2
West Virginia.....	1
Total.....	8
LOSSES.	
Indiana.....	1
Kansas.....	1
Kentucky.....	1
Maine.....	1
Nebraska.....	1
Ohio.....	1
South Carolina.....	1
Virginia.....	1
Total.....	8

These results are tempered with moderation; there are no extreme hardships, no gross inequality. Every objectionable feature is reduced to its lowest terms, and there only remains the smallest margin of that inconvenience and inequality incident to all human efforts to attain perfection. To be willing to suffer this is not too much to expect of statesmen who are sensible of the public need and animated by a patriotic desire to provide for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire in a feeble way to demonstrate the wisdom of keeping the membership of the House within its present numerical limit. The proposed number, 357, is as likely as any other to be the "magic one" that will secure the most of the best and the least of the worst results. In the demonstration of this it is necessary to have in mind the ends to be compassed by any regulation of the number of the House, constitutional or legislative. It is easy to deduce from the discussions in the Federal convention and from "Madison's Summary" the objects the "framers" set before them in considering the number of which the House should consist. Stated generally, they are:

(1) A body large enough to be a safe custodian of the interests with which it is charged and to secure the benefits of free consultation and discussion, as well as immunity from too easy combinations for improper purposes.

(2) A body small enough to avoid the confusion and feebleness resulting from the turbulence of numbers.

(3) Congressional districts as large as is compatible with the Representative's knowledge of the local circumstances of his constituents and his means of keeping up the necessary touch of elbow with them in sentiment and sympathy.

In determining the size of a legislative body with a view of effectually securing these ends it is quite obvious that too much arithmetic will be likely to vitiate the result. In a problem of this kind twice 3 are not always 6, but may be 4. The law of "diminishing returns" is plainly operative here. The "framers" evidently considered the principle that requires representation to increase with population, without due attention to its limitations.

A body of 357 members is, no doubt, a safer custodian of the public interests than one of 45, but no one believes that a body of 2,500 would be proportionably safer. There is a number within whose charmed circle is to be found the maximum effectiveness,

and inefficiency must increase in varying ratios as we depart either way from it.

What that number is in a given case is the "pinch." Here "many men have many minds." It is instructive to note the kaleidoscopic views our people entertain on the subject of representative ratios. The States are widely variant in the number of their legislative bodies; so much so that it makes us almost despair of ever being able to arrive at a conclusion which will unite in its support both reason and experience.

The subjoined statement, which I will incorporate in my remarks, shows the population and area of each State, the number of the upper and lower houses of their respective legislatures, and the ratio of population to each number. Though made eight years ago, it is approximately correct to-day.

Statement showing the population and area of the States, the number of representatives and senators, and the ratios of population to each member.

States.	Population.	Area, square miles.	Lower house.	Upper house.	Ratio in lower house.	Ratio in upper house.
Alabama	1,513,017	50,722	100	33	15,130	45,850
Arkansas	1,123,179	52,193	92	32	12,362	36,363
California	1,206,138	155,591.5	80	40	15,102	30,233
Colorado	412,138	104,550	49	25	8,412	15,554
Connecticut	746,258	4,750	249	21	3,000	35,536
Delaware	186,490	2,150	20	9	8,424	18,721
Florida	891,422	59,268	76	32	6,159	16,399
Georgia	1,837,353	58,000	175	44	10,500	41,798
Illinois	3,829,351	55,414	153	51	25,009	75,027
Indiana	2,195,404	33,800	100	50	21,624	43,848
Iowa	1,911,892	55,045	109	50	19,119	38,238
Kansas	1,427,096	80,891	125	40	11,417	35,673
Kentucky	1,858,635	37,690	100	38	18,590	48,911
Louisiana	1,118,587	29,924	98	36	11,415	31,072
Maine	661,086	35,000	151	31	4,378	21,325
Maryland	1,042,300	11,124	117	29	8,909	40,062
Massachusetts	2,238,943	7,800	240	40	9,329	55,974
Michigan	2,093,889	56,451	100	32	20,939	65,434
Minnesota	1,301,826	85,531	100	49	12,166	59,174
Mississippi	1,289,000	46,750	120	40	10,746	40,300
Missouri	2,679,184	65,350	140	34	18,736	78,800
Nebraska	1,058,910	75,095	100	33	10,589	35,297
Nevada	45,761	112,080	40	20	1,144	1,830
New Hampshire	376,536	9,491	321	24	1,173	31,377
New Jersey	1,444,933	8,320	60	21	24,082	68,806
New York	5,997,853	47,000	123	32	46,858	187,433
North Carolina	1,617,947	49,800	120	50	13,483	32,359
Ohio	3,672,316	39,964	110	37	33,084	90,232
Oregon	813,767	95,274	60	30	5,229	10,459
Pennsylvania	5,258,014	46,000	204	50	26,159	105,160
Rhode Island	345,306	1,054	72	36	4,799	9,597
South Carolina	1,151,149	34,000	124	25	9,283	24,883
South Dakota	323,808	77,000	121	48	2,635	6,850
Tennessee	1,767,513	45,600	99	33	17,553	70,701
Texas	2,235,523	274,356	106	31	21,000	72,114
Vermont	332,423	10,212	240	30	1,373	11,081
Virginia	1,655,980	38,348	100	40	16,559	38,511
West Virginia	762,794	23,000	65	26	11,735	31,783
Wisconsin	1,686,880	53,924	100	33	16,869	51,118

RATIOS IN THE STATES.

From this table the most incongruous results appear—whether we compare the legislative assemblies directly or consider their respective ratios of representation. For example, Connecticut, with an area of 4,150 square miles and a population of 746,258, has 249 representatives, a ratio of less than 3,000, while California, with more than thirty-two times the area and nearly double the population, has but one-third the representatives and a ratio of 15,102.

New Hampshire, with an area of 9,291 square miles and a population of 376,536, has 321 representatives, a ratio of 1,173, while New York, with an area about five times as great and about sixteen times the population, has a little over one-third as many representatives and a ratio more than forty times as large. Between other States almost as great disparity prevails. The smallest ratio is 1,144, in Nevada, and the largest, 46,858, in New York. A similar variety of ratios prevails in the senatorial representation of the States.

An equal contrariety of view seems to exist upon this subject among European nations, as appears from the table hereto appended, showing the size of their legislative bodies.

Statement showing the number of various European legislative bodies.

Austria-Hungary:	Japan:
Representative Assembly of the Empire	House of Representatives
120	300
Belgium:	Netherlands:
Representative body	Representative Chamber
138	100
Senate	Upper Chamber
60	50
Denmark:	Portugal:
Chamber of Representatives	Chamber of Deputies
102	173
Senate	Chamber of Peers
96	180
France:	Spain:
Chamber of Deputies	Congress of Deputies
576	440
Senate	Senate
300	360
Germany:	Sweden:
Representative body	Chamber of Deputies
307	222
Federal Council	Upper Chamber
58	148
Great Britain:	Norway:
House of Commons	Legislative Assembly
670	114
Greece:	Switzerland:
Chamber of Deputies	National Council
150	145
Italy:	Upper House
Chamber of Deputies	44
508	

FIRST PRINCIPLES.

It is thus apparent that we can derive little aid from the experience of the States or of other nations in the solution of our problem. Turning again to the experience of the Federal Legislature for a hundred years, and a few general principles, uniformly accepted by our people, we find abundant data to sustain the belief that a House of 357 members will be as safe a depository of the powers vested in it when our population is 100,000,000 and upward as it is now. A Representative stands to his district in a twofold relation, (1) as to territory; (2) as to population. As to the former relation it is well known that the existing districts vary widely in area. The Tenth district of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent, consists of a single county, having an area of about 1,000 square miles. The Eleventh district of Texas ten years ago was 120 times as large, consisting of 97 counties, with an area of 120,000 square miles. The large districts, it is easily seen, would diminish in territorial extent as population increases, while the smaller districts, in which population is more stable, would increase in extent with lapse of time.

In his relation to the people of his district the qualifications of a Representative are more exacting. A general knowledge of his constituents, their principles and their employments, and the laws under which they live, is quite essential. But any man who applies his intelligence to the subject can clearly see that with the largest ratio possible for a hundred years under the proposed limitation any man likely to be elected to Congress would easily meet all the conditions imposed either by the extent of his district or the number of his constituents. Mere numbers within a given area is not a matter of great consequence where there is similarity of interest and employment.

Diversity in the industries of the district is of much greater moment; but the natural limitations upon this will keep the business interests of the district within easy range of the Representative's knowledge. Moreover, with modern facilities for communication and transit a member can be as well acquainted with the sentiments, sympathies, employments, and interests of 300,000 people as with those of 30,000 scattered over the same area a hundred years ago, when Madison declared that "if the largest State in the Union be divided into ten or twelve districts the Representatives would possess an adequate knowledge of every local interest."

So that due attention to the reasons which lie nearest the nerve of the problem can hardly fail to produce a conviction that, as far as the qualifications of the members to render effective service are concerned, the number proposed will adequately respond to any demand that will be made upon them for a hundred years.

EVILS OF NUMBERS.

But the body must be large enough to secure the benefits of free discussion as well as immunity from too easy combinations for improper purposes. I hazard the statement that no man who witnessed the House of Representatives in action during some of the stormy scenes of the first session of the Fifty-first Congress will contend for a greater number to promote these important ends.

The deliberative character of the House is already impaired by its size. Its dignity is occasionally marred by conduct which would only be tolerated in a crowd. The behavior of members, the quality of debate, the attenuated wit and low-down retort which occasionally make the judicious gripe could not occur without the encouragement of numbers.

The enfeeblement born of confusion and turbulence is of all things to be avoided. Here we are already trembling on the edge of danger. The House is becoming unwieldy. A condition closely approaching chaos is possible to it in seasons of excitement. Much of the time the level of disorder is high enough to make it difficult for one-half the members to tell what the other half are doing.

It has been on rare occasions a very cave of Æolus with every wind let loose—deliberation impossible, profitable discussion out of the question, legislative business at a standstill, waiting for the storm to blow over. In these seasons of tumult the wisest head, the firmest hand, and the stoutest heart available in our time have been unequal to the task of maintaining the conditions necessary to the transaction of business. Without some restriction upon the tendency to increase, the House will continue to grow until confusion worse confounded will bring the nation to shame and invite the "lingual curse of Babel" to put an end to the stupendous folly of attempting to legislate in a mass meeting.

Few members of the House can be heard with distinctness in all parts of the Chamber without an exertion of the vocal organs which destroys every quality of voice which makes speaking or hearing agreeable and corrupts every excellence in oratory. If it were possible for this House to vitiate the morals and principles of the people as much as it has deprived the taste and corrupted style in public speaking, I should cry out with Daniel Webster, "God save the Republic!" Much of what passes for debate is only an exchange of vociferations across the Chamber. An unduly

loud voice is as disagreeable to most people as it was to the sensitive Cowper, who wrote:

Vociferated logic kills me quite;
A noisy man is always in the right.
I twirl my thumbs, fall back into my chair,
Fix on the wainscot a distressful stare,
And when I think his blunders all are out,
Reply discreetly, "To be sure; no doubt."

ECONOMY.

The arguments, Mr. Speaker, in support of this bill would not be complete without allusion to the cost of maintaining a numerous House of Representatives. No amount of growth and no stretch of prosperity ought to make us indifferent to the claims of economy in the administration of Government. No man who thinks well of his country and desires to minimize the burdens of the people will sanction the waste of public money upon officials who are not only needless, but who actually embarrass the legislation of the country.

The increase of 24 members by the last apportionment bill carries an addition to the annual appropriation for the House of at least \$200,000. In ten years it swells to \$2,000,000. An increment of 29 under the minority bill would involve an outlay of \$2,500,000 in ten years, and so on down the years, gathering in volume as the House swells in number.

In this connection I may add that \$57 members can be comfortably accommodated in the Hall of the House without any radical or expensive alterations in its architectural structure, while any number in excess of that would require extensive modifications of the interior construction of the building, destroying its architectural unity, impairing its symmetry and beauty, and causing great inconvenience and expense in the remodeling.

INFERIOR MEN.

Any comprehensive survey of the evils of an unduly numerous House must include the obvious source of weakness arising from the diminished responsibility of members as well as from the large number of inferior men likely to enter into its composition. An undue proportion of members of limited information and weak capacities make it easy for the few able and astute to direct and control legislation. Madison addressed himself to this view with great force and clearness. These are his words:

The more multitudinous a representative assembly may be rendered the more it will partake of the infirmities incident to collective meetings of the people. Ignorance will be the dupe of cunning, and passion the slave of sophistry and declamation. The people can never err more than in supposing that by multiplying their Representatives beyond a certain limit they strengthen the barrier against a government of a few. Experience will forever admonish them that, on the contrary, after securing a sufficient number for the purposes of safety, of local information, and of diffusive sympathy with the whole society, they will counteract their own views by every addition to their Representatives.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Some who favor a larger House refer us to some European legislatures as examples of ideal legislative bodies, notably the House of Commons. This is not a happy reference. Passing over the total dissimilarity of the American and English legislative bodies, and the fact that one does all the legislation for England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, and in a general way for the whole British Empire, while the other has for its limited sphere the remnant which remains after 45 State assemblies have supplied every local and State need, it is worthy of note that English statesmen do not conceal their belief that the House of Commons is too large for effective work, and no one conversant with the history of that body will fail to unite in that belief.

That it is able to transact business with any degree of dispatch under ordinary circumstances is due in a great degree to the non-attendance of members. But, lest the English example may be again quoted, I want to say very distinctly that if anything could bring greater reproach upon America than the scenes which occasionally occur in Congress, it would be what would be likely to occur after we had formed it on the model of the House of Commons. It has on its rolls 670 members, 40 of whom constitute a quorum to do business.

It rarely happens that more than two-thirds of the members are present at a time, and when there is a full attendance all but 360 must stand round like "bound boys," as that number exhausts the sitting space on the floor. No member can reserve a seat. The rules of the barber shop prevail. The "next" takes the seat until they are all occupied, and the hindmost stand or retire. If a member without a seat addresses the House, he holds his hat in his hand or puts it on the floor. If he has papers or books to which he desires to refer, he holds them in his arms or puts them in his pockets or on the floor. Gladstone objected to enlarging the hall, because, he said, "it is big enough."

T. P. O'Connor, M. P., in a recent article presents the House of Commons in a light which makes it anything but desirable for us to regard it as worthy of imitation. He says it consists of men who for the most part avoid the place as if it were infected with a pestilence; that it is the most unbusinesslike and ineffective

legislative instrument in the world. Members will not remain in the House unless there is something of unusual interest pending. Business of great importance may be under consideration, but unless there is hope of a scene or a sensation the House empties.

For example, the navy and army bills, dealing with the defenses of the country and carrying millions of dollars, are debated often in a House consisting of 10 or 15 members. A scrap of some kind, a personal squabble between two members, will fill the House with an excited and interested audience, while the highest interests of the Empire will leave the House cold and empty. Our own House of Representatives, with its present membership, scarcely escapes the enfeeblement and inefficiency of the House of Commons, and with an equal number our body would be equally unsatisfactory, and it would be said of this House, as it has been said of the House of Commons, that a man in the armor of the fifteenth century could not be more unwieldy, and we would witness scenes in this House, which have been witnessed in the House of Commons, when a member was addressing the House with but two others in the Chamber, and sometimes only the Speaker in the Chair.

TUMULT OF NUMBERS.

Such conditions, it must be confessed, are well calculated to discourage attendance. Members who receive no salary and have other business easily yield to the solicitations of interest or pleasure and remain away. When lured by the expectation of a "scene" or brought in by the "whips," when the "division bell" can not reach them, they swell the crowd, but they bring little of the element of deliberation and less acquaintance with the bearings of the legislation on hand, but much subserviency to the leaders—many elements of the mob—and ready passions to be played on by the fiery orators who marshal the contending hosts, and the result is precisely what could be foreseen—excited members shake their fists in the speaker's face, disorderly calls produce an uproar which an Englishman likened to a "cataract in a thunderstorm."

Members usually grave shouting with boyish abandonment, or in a frenzy of desperation struggling to lift their voices above the tumult of noises, comparable to those of a "zoo" "just before feeding time," the eloquence of honorable members seeming like a real representation of the Morse telegraphic alphabet, the alternate dot representing the utterances of one side and the alternate dash the groans of the opposition, and the whole tumultuous assembly "bedlam" more than a deliberate body of Christian statesmen. In depicting these occasional features of the House of Commons to illustrate the evil of undue numbers I have only borrowed, in the main, the delineations of Englishmen who saw what they described.

AN EXAMPLE TO BE SHUNNED.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is this the parliamentary feast to which American legislators are invited? Certainly an example so worthy to be shunned will no longer be held up for our imitation. The consequences of an unwieldy and overnumerous House of sturdy Britons ought to admonish us to avoid similar dangers and make us sensible of the necessity of keeping the House of Representatives within the numerical limit of an effectively working body. To effect this wise and salutary end after a hundred years will be a reform which—

Is not the hasty product of a day,
But the well-ripened fruit of wise delay.

Reapportionment Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT D. SHAW,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, January 7, 1901.

On the bill (H. R. 12740) making an apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Twelfth Census.

Mr. SHAW said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I am in trouble over the questions arising under the apportionment issues now before this House, and will endeavor to explain the perplexities and doubts pressing upon my mind and conscience concerning my sworn duty in connection therewith. As one of the latest to come into this body, with the oath of office still fresh on my lips, confronted with the grave constitutional mandates regarding the apportionment now under discussion, it causes me some hesitancy.

That the issues involved are of grave importance all here admit;

and that great prudence and wisdom are necessary in reaching a just and safe conclusion is equally clear. As for myself, I have no difficulty over the two bills presented to the House by the chairman of the Census Committee [Mr. HOPKINS] and by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH].

These bills differ mainly as to the ratio upon which to base the representation of States, and the advocates each have defended their views and conclusions with unusual force and eloquence.

As to these bills, it can be truly said that each has strong points in its favor and that no constitutional barriers have been thrown down in their preparation, assuming that each State of this Union has observed the constitutional safeguards and rights of all citizens in the last elections. The so-called Hopkins bill proceeds upon the basis of limiting the membership of this House to its present number, 357, and the Burleigh bill is based upon an increased membership of 29, enlarging the House to 386 members. So far as precedents are or should be a guide, from the First Census, in 1790, down to the Eleventh, in 1890—a period of one hundred years—with only one exception—that of the Sixth Census, in 1840—the ratios established increased the number of Representatives, as the following table will show:

	Year.	Ratio.	Representatives.
Constitution		30,000	65
First Census	1790	33,000	105
Second Census	1800	33,000	141
Third Census	1810	35,000	181
Fourth Census	1820	40,000	213
Fifth Census	1830	47,700	240
Sixth Census	1840	70,680	223
Seventh Census	1850	93,423	233
Eighth Census	1860	127,381	243
Ninth Census	1870	131,425	293
Tenth Census	1880	151,911	325
Eleventh Census	1890	173,901	357

From this table it will be seen that the percentage of increase in Representatives since the one reduction in the Sixth Census, of 1840, has been as follows: In 1850, 4½ per cent; in 1860, a fraction over 4 per cent; in 1870, something over 20 per cent; in 1880, a little less than 10 per cent, and in 1890, a little over 10 per cent. Under the ratio of the Burleigh bill the percentage of increase is a fraction over 8 per cent. The proof is conclusive that the policy of enlarging the membership of the House of Representatives is a national one, as shown in the first one hundred years of its history. The question of the seating capacity of this Hall, as proved by the plan before us, is settled in the affirmative beyond fair dispute. The question of architects, acoustics, and rules can be easily determined.

The more important consideration as to the wisdom of increasing the membership at the present time is one each member must consider and settle for himself under his oath of office. I shall not attempt any extended remarks upon this point, first, because the past precedents are my guide as to my own views, and, second, for the reason that others with far greater weight of judgment have already gone pretty fully over the question. I believe, however, that the theory upon which our Government was modeled had in view the enlargement of the House of Representatives under the increasing population of the Union. The two Senators from each State—small or great in area and population—were to be offset by the enlarged membership of States in proportion to their growth. One was a fixed, the other an expanding representation.

As has been ably set forth in this debate, our present House is small in comparison with the membership of the foreign parliaments of the world. I am of the opinion that it is a wise policy to reasonably increase the Representatives of our nation in conformity with past precedents. The duties of each member here increase from year to year, and it will in a measure bring relief by enlarging the membership of this House. I feel that it is better to increase the membership here than to unduly enlarge the population of our constituencies.

With this view, I am in favor of the Burleigh bill. Under its provisions the great State of New York will gain three members, as compared with one under the Hopkins bill, and this seems to me in every way fair and desirable. But, Mr. Speaker, a broader question, that of the constitutional rights of citizens in some of the States of our Union, as specified in much detail in the official report accompanying a proposed bill known as the Crumpacker bill, is one which is profoundly perplexing and difficult for me to satisfactorily solve. Charges are made that the right of suffrage has been denied large numbers of American citizens in certain States of this Republic, and the particulars are described in such a manner as must arouse the keenest solicitude over the rights of the negro race of every true lover of our country and liberty.

I have diligently sought to inform myself of the basis of these

charges, and in this search the following statistics, prepared wholly from official records, have been in part the result:

Ratio of votes to population in each State and in the Northern and Southern States, respectively, in the Congressional election of 1898; also number of votes required to elect a Congressman in the North and South, respectively.

States.	Population (census of 1900).	Vote, 1898 (Congressional Directory).	Votes per each 1,000 inhabitants.
California	1,485,053	272,511	183.5
Colorado	539,700	144,101	267
Connecticut	908,355	148,109	163
Delaware	184,735	42,007	227.3
Idaho	161,772	39,091	241.6
Illinois	4,821,550	873,328	181.2
Indiana	2,516,462	567,821	225.6
Iowa	2,231,853	419,994	188.1
Kansas	1,470,495	281,143	191.1
Kentucky	2,147,174	251,626	117.2
Maine	694,406	86,815	125
Maryland	1,190,050	217,002	182.3
Massachusetts	2,805,346	312,222	111.3
Michigan	2,420,982	415,852	171.7
Minnesota	1,751,394	248,157	141.8
Missouri	3,106,005	551,406	177.5
Montana	243,329	49,787	204.6
Nebraska	1,008,539	188,172	176.1
Nevada	42,333	8,907	210.3
New Hampshire	411,588	81,315	107.5
New Jersey	1,883,660	332,140	176.3
New York	7,238,012	1,323,930	182.1
North Dakota	319,146	45,620	142.9
Ohio	4,157,545	769,803	185.2
Oregon	413,536	82,875	200.4
Pennsylvania	6,302,115	939,786	149.1
Rhode Island	428,556	38,093	89
South Dakota	401,570	71,902	179.1
Utah	276,749	59,272	214.2
Vermont	343,641	52,079	151.5
Washington	518,103	75,776	146.3
West Virginia	958,800	174,056	181.5
Wisconsin	2,069,042	322,029	155.7
Wyoming	92,531	19,671	212.6
Total	55,634,858	9,506,918	170.9

Southern States.	Population.	Vote, 1898.	Votes per each 1,000 inhabitants.
Alabama	1,823,697	91,131	49.8
Arkansas	1,311,564	27,678	21.1
Florida	528,542	32,942	62.4
Georgia	2,216,331	65,739	31
Louisiana	1,381,625	33,208	24
Mississippi	1,551,270	28,860	17.3
North Carolina	1,893,810	331,352	174.6
South Carolina	1,340,316	28,831	21.5
Tennessee	2,630,616	177,902	68
Texas	3,048,710	421,539	138.3
Virginia	1,854,184	172,302	92.3
Total	18,975,665	1,412,484	74.4

Average number of votes required to elect a Congressman in the—	
North	35,740
South	15,694
State of New York	38,939
States of Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina	5,934
Number of votes necessary to elect 34 Congressmen in the State of New York	1,323,930
Number of votes necessary to elect 35 Congressmen in the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina	207,708

Scattering votes not noted in the Congressional Directory of December, 1900, were supplied from the New York Tribune Almanac for 1900, as follows: Alabama, 72; Colorado, 2,077; Connecticut, 413; Georgia, 34; Idaho, 914; Iowa, 1,442; Maine, 438; Michigan, 470; Missouri, 271; Washington, 2,064.

The picture thus presented is one which should demand prompt and serious consideration. It seems to show that the negro vote has been largely eliminated in a number of Southern States from some cause. What that cause is it is the duty of Congress to find out, if possible, at the earliest moment, in my opinion. An analysis of the table I have presented discloses many surprising evidences of the inequality of representation, as proved by the records of the Congressional election of 1898. The fact that to elect 34 Congressmen in the State of New York there were cast 1,323,930 votes and to elect 35 Congressmen in the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina it took only 207,708 is a difference in voting power which, under the charges that this is due to wholesale disfranchisement of citizens of the United States, is both startling and alarming, to say the least.

This table further shows that in the Northern States the average votes per each 1,000 inhabitants is 170.9 and in the Southern States 74.4, and that the average votes required to elect a Congressman in the North is 35,740 and in the South 15,694. This is the result of the comparison, broadly stated, but the average votes required to elect a Congressman in the State of New York is 38,939, while

in the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina it takes only an average of 5,934 to elect a member, as shown in the Congressional election returns for 1898. I think this showing should be regarded as convincing reasons why an exhaustive and impartial investigation should be undertaken by the Census Committee of this House, so as to officially place before this body a full and clear review of all the facts entering into this remarkable political condition. Feeling this as a duty, I was in full sympathy with the resolution offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED], as follows:

Whereas the continued enjoyment of full representation in this House by any State which has, for reasons other than participation in rebellion or other crime, denied to any of the male inhabitants thereof being 21 years of age and citizens of the United States the right to vote for Representatives in Congress, Presidential electors, and other specified officers is in direct violation of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, which declares that in such case the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which such male citizens bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State, and is an invasion of the rights and dignity of this House and of its members and an infringement upon the rights and privileges in this House of other States and their Representatives; and

Whereas since the last apportionment the States of Mississippi, South Carolina, and Louisiana have by changes in the constitutions and statutes of said States, and for reasons other than participation in rebellion and other crimes, denied the right of suffrage to male inhabitants, 21 years of age, citizens of the United States, and such denial in each of said States extends to more than one-half of those who prior thereto were entitled to vote, as appears from the following statistics, published in the Congressional Directories of the Fifty-second and Fifty-sixth Congresses, viz: In the 7 districts of Mississippi the total vote cast for all Congressional candidates in 1890 was 62,652; in 1898, 27,045. In the 7 districts of South Carolina the total vote in 1890 was 73,522, and 28,831 in 1898. In the 6 districts of Louisiana, 74,542 in 1890 and 33,161 in 1898. One member of the present House, representing 10 counties in Mississippi, with a population in 1890 of 184,297, received only 2,008 votes. One member of the present House, representing 6 counties in South Carolina, with a population in 1890 of 158,851, received only 1,735 votes, and one member, representing 13 counties in Louisiana, with a population of 208,802, received only 2,494 votes; and

Whereas it is a matter of common rumor that other States have, for reasons other than those specified in the Constitution of the United States, denied to some of their male inhabitants, 21 years old and citizens of the United States, the right to vote for members of Congress and Presidential electors, as well as executive and judicial officers of said States, and members of the legislatures thereof, and no reduction has been made in the representation of any State in this House because of such denial; and

Whereas the President of the United States has, by message, recommended "that the Congress at its present session apportion the representation among the several States as provided by the Constitution;" Therefore,

Resolved, Section 1. That the Committee on Census shall be and is authorized and requested, either by full committee or such subcommittee or subcommittees as may be appointed by the chairman thereof, to inquire, examine, and report in what State the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, 21 years of age and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crimes, and the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in each such State.

That this dignified and statesmanlike preamble and resolution should have been received by several of the Southern members of this House with keen resentment and under a challenge twice repeated by different speakers that it was "a firebrand" thrown into the discussion of the apportionment was to many here, I doubt not, as it certainly was to me, a great surprise. This preamble and resolution are based upon official data of undoubted accuracy and within the plain provisions of the Constitution. Grave charges have been made that drastic means have been resorted to in order that the disfranchisement of great numbers of citizens of the United States might be accomplished for a special political purpose in the Southern States. This whole question is one of grave constitutional importance, and deserves to be settled on broad lines of constitutional law and right.

It is not a question of mere partisan politics, but one of vital constitutional righteousness. If the statements detailed in the preamble and resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania are true, or in part true, then it is the sworn duty of every member of this House to provide ways and means to right the existing political wrongs! And if they are not true, then the truth should be known, in the broad interest of national concord and justice, and the sooner the better. As to our sworn duty here it may be well to again present the constitutional provisions governing the legal entry to this body:

ARTICLE XIV.

SECTION 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

SEC. 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

ARTICLE XV.

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The meaning of section 2 is very clearly set forth in Mr. CRUMPACKER'S views as given in his dissenting report:

For instance, if a State with a population of 1,500,000 should disfranchise 40 per cent of its male citizens over 21 years of age, for any reason except for participation in rebellion or other crime, in apportioning Representatives the population of that State would be reduced 40 per cent, and it would be given representation on a basis of 900,000. It is as much a part of the constitutional scheme to reduce the basis of apportionment in States that have disfranchised male citizens 21 years of age as it is to base representation upon population at all. The language of the Constitution is clear, direct, and mandatory, and it leaves no discretion in Congress whatever. The form of expression is imperative and not permissive—"the basis of representation shall be reduced."

The constitutional provisions are mandatory. They leave no escape legally for the timeserver or trifler. The spirit of these provisions is as clear as the letter, and the declaration is that we "shall" see them safeguarded. We are left no discretion under their stringent mandates. Only one question is to be determined by the members of this House, and that is, "Have these constitutional provisions been abridged or disobeyed?" If they have, it is our plain and imperative duty to promptly apply the constitutional remedy. This is a sworn and clear duty—not one of politics merely. It involves high constitutional obedience, no more and no less; and it is one so sacred and so majestic, under our free Constitution, that every American citizen should stand on the front advanced line to keep sacred and inviolate this immutable basis of our liberties.

It seems to me that this vital question of disfranchisement is one of the most weighty interests of our civilization that has come before the American people since the great war of the sixties, and I regard it as the duty of every American citizen to resolutely demand that the plain provisions of the Constitution shall be jealously defended and impartially executed. To this end fair and full discussion is always in order, and especially so here. I present in this connection the sections of the Mississippi, Louisiana, and North Carolina election laws relating to the rights of certain citizens as voters:

The number of colored males of voting age in these three States was, in 1890, 320,000, and now, presumably, reaches 450,000, thus representing a population of over 2,000,000 in these States alone, "without the consent of the governed." It will be seen that the Louisiana and North Carolina laws are especially framed for the purpose of making the educational test apply only to the colored population, as all persons who were voters prior to January 1, 1867, and the lineal descendants of all persons who were voters prior to that date are exempt from the provision of the law which disqualifies persons because of illiteracy.

MISSISSIPPI.

SEC. 244. On and after the 1st day of January, A. D. 1892, every elector shall, in addition to the foregoing qualifications, be able to read any section of the constitution of this State; or he shall be able to understand the same when read to him, or give a reasonable interpretation thereof. A new registration shall be made before the next ensuing election after January 1, A. D. 1892.

LOUISIANA.

SEC. 3. He (the voter) shall be able to read and write, and shall demonstrate his ability to do so when he applies for registration, by making, under oath administered by the registration officer or his deputy, written application therefor, in the English language, or his mother tongue, which application shall contain the essential facts necessary to show that he is entitled to register and vote, and shall be entirely written, dated, and signed by him, in the presence of the registration officer or his deputy, without assistance or suggestion from any person or memorandum whatever, except the form of application hereinafter set forth: *Provided, however*, That if the applicant be unable to write his application in the English language, he shall have the right, if he so demands, to write the same in his mother tongue from the dictation of an interpreter; and if the applicant is unable to write his application by reason of physical disability, the same shall be written at his dictation by the registration officer or his deputy, upon his oath of such disability. The application for registration, above provided for, shall be a copy of the following form, with the proper names, dates, and numbers substituted for the blanks appearing therein, to wit:

I am a citizen of the State of Louisiana. My name is ——. I was born in the State (or country) of —, parish (or county) of —, on the — day of —, in the year —. I am now — years — months and — days of age. I have resided in this State since —, and am not disfranchised by any provision of the constitution of this State.

SEC. 4. If he be not able to read and write, as provided by section 3 of this article, then he shall be entitled to register and vote if he shall, at the time he offers to register, be the bona fide owner of property assessed to him in this State at a valuation of not less than \$200 on the assessment roll of the current year, if the roll of the current year shall not then have been completed and filed, and on which, if such property be personal only, all taxes due shall have been paid.

SEC. 5. No male person who was on January 1, 1867, or at any date prior thereto, entitled to vote under the constitution or statute of any State of the United States, wherein he then resided, and no son or grandson of any such person not less than 21 years of age at the date of the adoption of this constitution, and no male person of foreign birth, who was naturalized prior to the first day of January, 1892, shall be denied the right to register and vote in this State by reason of his failure to possess the educational or property qualifications prescribed by this constitution: *Provided*, He shall have resided in this State for five years next preceding the date at which he shall apply for registration, and shall have registered in accordance with the terms of this article prior to September 1, 1892; and no person shall be entitled to register under this section after said date.

NORTH CAROLINA.

SEC. 4. Every person presenting himself for registration shall be able to read and write any section of the constitution in the English language; and, before

he shall be entitled to vote, he shall have paid, on or before the 1st day of May of the year in which he proposes to vote, his poll tax for the previous year as prescribed by Article V, section 1, of the constitution. But no male person who was, on January 1, 1867, or at any time prior thereto, entitled to vote under the laws of any State in the United States wherein he then resided, and no lineal descendant of any such person, shall be denied the right to register and vote at any election in this State by reason of his failure to possess the educational qualification herein prescribed, provided he shall have registered in accordance with the terms of this section prior to December, 1908.

The general assembly shall provide for the registration of all persons entitled to vote without the educational qualifications herein prescribed, and shall, on or before November 1, 1908, provide for the making of a permanent record of such registration, and all persons so registered shall forever thereafter have the right to vote in all elections by the people in this State, unless disqualified under section 2 of this article: *Provided*, Such person shall have paid his poll tax as above required.

It is widely charged that the intent of the framers of these late amendments to the constitutions of the several Southern States named was to shut out negro voters from the polls. This charge has been eloquently denied by distinguished Southern members of Congress during this debate. The issue is one of fact, and the only way to determine the facts is by an exhaustive Congressional investigation. I deeply regret that this did not receive first attention in this apportionment by this body. "Right wrongs no man" is an adage as old as civilization, and at this period of irritation and unrest over the issue of disfranchisement, which will soon have to be met and composed, it would have been statesmanlike and wise to have first officially ascertained the facts regarding all the charges and denials about the abridgment of the constitutional rights of negroes in the South before any apportionment bill was considered in this House.

I shall not be unfair to any section or State in quoting the remark of the president of the convention that framed the Louisiana constitution, as showing his view of the work that had been done in framing the new articles: "What care I whether it be more or less ridiculous or not? Doesn't it meet the case? Doesn't it let the white man vote, and doesn't it stop the negro from voting? And isn't that what we came here for?" Again, Senator TILLMAN, with brave frankness, said in the convention that adopted the constitution of that State in 1895: "It has always been my cardinal doctrine as a public man that all white men, as far as the enjoyment of the privileges of government and the emoluments of office are concerned, should be equal in this State, and that the majority alone should govern." There can be no doubt about what the meaning of this famous Senator was in the above announcement of his political views.

In view of the official returns already given in this connection, it would appear that the system presumably adopted to disfranchise the negroes in some of the Southern States has been an undoubted success. Starting in the early part of March last, I made an itinerary of visitations, embracing nearly every Southern State, in my capacity as commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic. During my extended tour I endeavored specially to study carefully the environments of the negroes who had served their country in the great war. I had exceptional facilities for doing this, and for discussing their status under a wide range of conditions. I became acquainted with many of the leading friends of the negroes, men who had served in the Union armies in many cases, and with others who took a deep interest in the welfare of the colored people. Some little time ago I wrote several of these prominent comrades and friends regarding the situation, so far as any constitutional amendments of laws in the Southern States led to disfranchising negroes therein. I submit several of the replies I received as germane to this discussion. I do not give the names of the writers simply because of local prejudices, perfectly well understood by every member of this House. I can vouch for their genuineness.

[From Louisiana.]

I inclose herewith copy of resolution adopted at meeting of fifteenth department encampment, and a copy of the same was forwarded to the State constitutional convention then in session in the city of New Orleans.

Never before in the history of the world can it be shown where such a terrible outrage was perpetrated by a civilized and enlightened people. What would a Bismarck or a Gladstone say to such an act?

"Be it resolved, That this department encampment of the Department of Louisiana and Mississippi, Grand Army of the Republic, recognizing that politics or the discussion of political questions are not allowable under the rules and regulations of the order, yet deem it fit and proper to request as a matter of simple justice that the State constitutional convention now assembled grant to the honorably discharged Union veteran soldiers of the war of 1861-1865 the right to register and vote in the State of Louisiana."

Men who under the most trying hardships and difficulties bravely and heroically fought in defense of their country and flag, and then to be deprived of the rights of citizenship of the nation they helped to save, by the very people who fought to destroy it. You may rest assured that the time will come when the descendants of these same people will hang their heads with shame on account of the action of their fathers or grandfathers in having voted for such an unjust, tyrannical measure.

I also forward to you herewith a copy of blank which the law directs each applicant shall fill up in his own handwriting before he can secure a certificate of registration which will entitle him to vote. Now, I can testify under oath that at least 100 men in the ward where I reside have filled up these blanks correctly, and yet were refused registration papers. Upon the other hand, I have known many instances where white men could not fill up these blanks and were promptly assisted in the performance of their duties by the clerks of registration.

Again, it will be seen how the laws of Louisiana discriminate against the colored men, as under our constitution all men (without regard to educa-

tional or property qualifications) are permitted to vote whose fathers or grandfathers were voters prior to the year 1867.

I sincerely hope and pray that the Congress of the United States may, in its great wisdom, be able to devise some method which will result in removing from the statutes of Louisiana and other Southern States these monstrous acts.

[From Alabama.]

I have been at a great loss to discover how any member of Congress, who has taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, can deliberately permit the mandates of the fourteenth amendment thereto to be violated. Several of the Southern States have already abridged the suffrage, so far as their colored citizens are concerned, and the remaining Southern States will follow in the same course. Those first referred to are Louisiana, Mississippi, South and North Carolina. In my opinion, it is not only just to said States, but to other States of the Union, and in strict conformity with the Constitution, to reduce their representation in Congress in proportion as the right to vote by the citizens of said States has been abridged. The extent to which this has been done may properly become a matter for Congressional inquiry, and hence it has appeared to me unwise to pass an apportionment bill until the facts are fully known, and then base representation accordingly.

A great many men of high character in the South, who have always been Democrats, but who conscientiously think that the interests of their respective States require an abridgement of colored suffrage, admit that it would be just and proper to curtail their representation accordingly. I am unable to conceive how any Northern Representative can advocate a basis of representation in Congress whereby it would require about five citizens of one section to be equal to three of another. Any such basis of representation is so palpably unjust and unequal that it has seemed to me the slightest reflection would convince any fair-minded man that nothing but discontent could follow such a course. I had sincerely hoped that Congress would not make a mistake in this matter. I have seen it stated, as coming from some excellent men, that the inequality would adjust itself by a future division of parties, and in said division the Republican party would really secure the advantage. A residence of thirty odd years in the South, and active participation in the political revolution that has taken place there since the war, persuades me that any such view is fallacious and chimerical.

[From Louisiana.]

While the people of the South have great admiration for those who stand firmly by their honest convictions, yet their opposition in this State is so bitter against the negro exercising the rights of citizenship that I feel quite sure they would have no kind feeling toward those who would in any way aid in a reduction of their representation in Congress as a consequence of the disfranchisement of the colored man. * * *

It is very difficult for me to understand how any just man who believes it unwise to permit the colored man to vote should desire to have this same man to be placed on an equality with the white man in making an apportionment for representation in Congress.

The action of the white people of Louisiana in bringing about, through intimidation, fraud, and violence, nearly a total disfranchisement of the colored voter is not only one of the most infamous acts ever perpetrated by a civilized people, but it also exhibits a disrespectful and disloyal feeling toward the Government of the United States.

It carries with it a nullification of the conditions which were made requisite for the States in rebellion to return to their old positions in the Union. I can not understand how the loyal people of the nation can tamely submit to such terrible outrages.

Shall we bow in humble submission before those who labored so earnestly to destroy our country and flag, and acknowledge that the terrible sacrifices freely offered during the war of the rebellion in behalf of freedom and equal rights were made in vain?

The white people of the South were alone responsible for every evil that occurred through the enfranchisement of the negro. In Louisiana the colored people prayed to their former masters to cooperate with them; they would cheerfully vote for white men to hold the offices and make the laws, and in return they only desired to be furnished with such public-school facilities as would enable them to better prepare their children to discharge the duties of citizenship, and 90 per cent of all ex-Federal soldiers who were then residents of the State were ready and anxious to lend their influence to bring about this friendly and harmonious action between the white and colored voters. If this fair and judicious method could have then been adopted, and good faith had been maintained between the parties, what a great blessing it would have been to all the people of Louisiana; what a terrible amount of suffering and bloodshed could have been avoided.

Our fertile and beautiful Commonwealth would have become the garden spot of the world. Property would have enhanced in value millions of dollars. The greatest feeling of good will and confidence would have existed among all classes of people. And such noble and Christianlike conduct would have pleased the Great Architect of the Universe that great blessing would have been freely bestowed upon all his children. But no; at the time of the adoption of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States a large majority of the white people of the South were bitterly opposed to granting the right of suffrage to the colored man. Notwithstanding their fierce opposition, this great privilege was secured for the negro, and then the old white opposition began to make a fight to obtain control of the State. And the issue made by them through the press and by their campaign orators was not that they were opposed to colored men voting, but that they only desired to place honest and competent men in office.

In 1870, when the Democrats obtained possession of the State government, it would have been at the risk of one's life to have made a public statement to the effect that the Democratic party of Louisiana would ever attempt to deprive the negro of the right of franchise. So you can readily see that the fight against the colored men in the South since the close of the war has been founded on fraud, violence, and injustice.

While the Republican party was in control of the State of Louisiana (a large majority of whose voters were colored men), the affairs of state were well administered. No lynchings were heard of, and but few small defalcations were reported. Soon after the Democratic party came in possession the State treasurer left for Central America, and has not returned up to the present. The amount of money he took with him never was reported, but I have often heard it estimated to be over a million of dollars, and a New Orleans city Democratic official left for Mexico, and it was reported he took with him about a like amount. You will find by the records that in a large number of the Southern States, under Democratic administration, State treasurers have been defaulters to a large amount.

All classes of our citizens here will cheerfully testify that the only two reform administrations elected in the city of New Orleans since the war was secured by the colored vote.

The colored man is not afraid to take his chance with his white brother on an educational or property qualification if justice and fairness is shown him. But in Louisiana the white man can be registered if his father or grandfather was a voter at the date when most of the colored men were slaves. And as to educational qualifications, why, the most learned man in the country if his skin be dark will be refused registration in the city of New Orleans.

With these facts before me, I can not understand how any member of Congress can consistently object to the reduction of representation to the basis of the legally registered votes.

I present these statements of men of high character and large experience in the South, and their views tend to bear out in words what the statistics I have used verify—i. e., that disfranchisement of American citizens, on a widely extended scale, has been carried on in Southern States in comparatively recent elections. The able speech of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LINNEY] was surcharged with statistics and statements almost commanding in their evidence of disfranchisement of American citizens in his State. As a Southern witness, who followed the "Stars and Bars" in the great war, his speech was a powerful plea for justice, in the interest of right and liberty, one that will not soon be forgotten by those who listened to its effective reasoning and dramatic eloquence. His arraignment of the legislature of his State for repealing the writ of mandamus was most impressive, and yet no Democrat from his State rose to deny his charge in this important respect. Referring to the repeal of mandamus, he said:

Mandamus had its origin in the court of King's Bench five centuries ago. It was regarded as the flower of the King's Bench. It was regarded as a judicial prerogative. The court had the same power to issue the writ that it has in this country to issue an order of contempt to preserve order in the court. I thought at first, and many lawyers in the State of North Carolina, some Democrats, concurred with me that a statute repealing mandamus was unconstitutional and void; but upon investigation I found that the writ of mandamus was not a judicial prerogative, but was subject to legislative control by the State.

Now, this grand writ, which is the twin sister of habeas corpus and which is as essential to the enforcement of the rights of the citizen against despotism or other malfeasance of an officer as the writ of habeas corpus is as to personal liberty; that writ which had existed in the State of North Carolina alongside of habeas corpus, without any thought of its having been abolished, in less than two months from the time we held the meeting in the city of Greensboro to determine what remedy we could apply, and concluded that our only remedy was mandamus, was abolished. It leaked out—some man from our meeting—some one told them of it, and they called the legislature together and passed this act; and such an act!

Now, I challenge any lawyer on this floor, any Democrat or Republican, or any gentleman upon this floor to point to a single instance where any legislature has ever attempted to lay its hands upon the writ of mandamus. It can not be shown. It would have produced a revolution up in Yankedom, where the coolest people in the world live. I have examined the authorities of some States, and I find that by this high prerogative writ the fraudulent hand of a bad officer and at other times bad electors has been paralyzed and made harmless by the writ. Here it is repealed. What for? What has that to do with rape committed by negroes on white women? What has mandamus to do with that, pray tell me? What was the purpose of it? They knew as well as they could that the Lord of Hosts lives and presides over the affairs of men; that the effect and purpose of this law was to prevent the courts from interfering with their wicked designs.

In the elaborate argument, backed by full statistics, submitted by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LINNEY], he called attention to the fact that the methods and purpose of the Democracy in North Carolina is to disfranchise Republicans. They bring the race question to the front at every election to influence the public mind on the racial question, that being simply a cover to secure Democratic supremacy by any means. To demonstrate this he calls attention that the official returns show that in eight counties in his State—those being the only eight that have clear negro majorities of the voting population—the election machinery was in the hands of the Democrats, and there was 14,000 majority for that party in those counties, having a colored population of more than 30,000 majority. And, be it remembered, this result was proclaimed in an election involving the disfranchisement of the negroes! Such a statement from such a source, strongly corroborated by official data, is enough to stir up a line of thought not at all complimentary to the spirit and purpose of such unlawful and unconstitutional acts.

Mr. Speaker, I have no harsh words to use in this discussion. It is a subject too solemn and momentous for the display of such a spirit. The political situation in the Southern States, so far as this disfranchisement question is concerned, is a serious constitutional one. If the rights of American citizens have been and are being abridged there, the "shall" of the Constitution must be obeyed and its remedy applied, or we will lose our high estate as a liberty-loving and liberty-defending nation. It is not a question of a "white man's" rule, but one of an American citizen's constitutional rights. If not, why not? The fruits of the stupendous struggle of the sixties were garnered into the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to our Constitution, and thus became a part of the fundamental law. These are inviolate, as fixed as the north star. And they will forever remain a monument to the saviors of the nation to full liberty.

Some people claim that the equal rights granted to the negro race were a huge mistake. That question is not germane to this discussion. The negro race was raised to an American citizen's estate by the spirit of liberty, after the greatest internecine war of the world had closed in a complete victory. Wise or unwise, the Constitution guarantees the negro the equal protection of our laws and our liberties, and our sacred honor is pledged to this. He is an American citizen panoplied by our Constitution. I know well how serious the "negro problem" of the South is, and I also believe that time, prudence, wisdom, and the following of the rules of the Great Teacher—of "bearing each other's burdens"

and "doing unto others as ye would that others should do unto you"—will compose all the irritations and dangers so much in evidence in the present, in God's good time.

I have spoken of my visitations in the South during the past year, and feel sure that reproducing my speech made at the reunion of the "blue and the gray" at Atlanta on July 21, 1900, will prove how fully and in what a broad spirit I covered the ground of past differences between the South and the North from a private Union soldier's point of view. The spirit of fraternal concord displayed at that memorable meeting of former foes, on one of the famous battlefields of the great war, will be a sweet memory to their dying day with everyone who was present. And I believe that the same spirit displayed at this reunion should dominate all American hearts. This verbatim report of my address is taken from the Atlanta Constitution:

I am proud to be present on this battlefield of the great war and to meet and great comrades and veterans of the North and of the South on this anniversary of the Peachtree Creek battle of the sixties. I am not here to speak of its details, for others will recount the reminiscent features of this famous fight who were participants on either side; but I am present as a Union veteran, to show my full sympathy with reunions of this sort, where brave former foes, once engaged in the hot rush of contending armies, now meet as friends and fellow-citizens, with common aims and in common loyalty to the greatest Republic of the world. I am to speak to-day not officially as the commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, but as a veteran and a private soldier of Company A, Thirty-fifth New York Volunteers, in which I carried a gun for two years, what wells up in my heart on this great occasion. I believe the time has come when plain words should be spoken of a past that will forever witch the world by its great deeds and great men, covering the period of American history between 1861 and 1865.

THE GREAT WAR DAYS.

I will not dwell long upon the unhappy trend of events which led up to the opening of the great war here and now. It will be enough to say that the South and the North became divided in the current of national ideas and sentiments of liberty, and slavery and State's rights became the cause of an "irrepressible conflict" between two great sections of the Union. Our diplomacy and statecraft lamentably failed to compose the sectional differences that divided the nation along sectional lines, and the final appeal to the bloody court of war through the cruel arbitrament of the sword came as the last resort in the composing of vital questions in which the fate of the Union was at stake.

And there followed four years of the fiercest internecine war of all ages, fought in the main by armies of volunteers on either side, composed of the flower of the North and of the South, equally brave, equally as honest in their convictions of duty, and of a girth and brain of lofty patriotism that has won for their soldierly qualities the admiration of the whole world. The great struggle was a stupendous conflict unparalleled in its sacrifices in the history of wars. More and greater battles were fought and more men were killed, wounded, and died of disease than ever before went to their doom in the horrid holocaust of war during any similar period in history.

THE CAVALIER AND PURITAN.

The end came at Appomattox, and the Cavalier Lee and the Puritan Grant faced each other on the closing scene of the most pathetic and bloody drama of all the ages. The half-drawn sword was motioned back, and the victorious leader's words sounded forth the death knell of past national divisions and greeted the glorious dawn of a new destiny, when he said: "How many rations do your hungry soldiers need?" And then followed the blessed assurance that horses and side arms could be retained, the former as helps in the new life of peace and the latter as evidence of personal loyalty. What a scene was this, my countrymen? Here stood side by side the grand representative of the Cavaliers and the splendid type of the Puritans, facing a new epoch in the history of the saved nation. In this hour, big with events, the Puritan and Cavalier were merged into a new product of our soil, the one representative type of the future within our Union, the American Christian citizen. Time's curtain then dropped down to shut out from view the carnage of war, blood ceased to flow, and only the memories of the dread strife remained. Peace, sweet peace, came to bless all homes and to gladden all hearts within the circle of our Union.

A NEW DESTINY.

The era of war had ended and the epoch of peace began. If it be true that there are no birds in last year's bird's nest, and that there can be no turning of the wheel with the water that has passed, so also must it be true that dead and gone events in the life of individuals and nations must rest upon the history of the recorded years. The decision reached at Appomattox was that slavery and State's rights and the Stars and Bars should be surrendered, and henceforth there should be but one flag, one faith, one indissoluble Union, and one ideal and sentiment of American citizenship. This was the immutable basis of the final settlement of the questions fought to a finish in blood and agony, in a sum total of sacrifice almost appalling to contemplate. Ours was not a war of conquest, but a war to commandingly solve and settle the problems sectionalism had brought into view, for it had come to pass that national unity was at an end unless this could be done. As the great Lincoln tersely and wisely stated the issue, the nation could not exist "half slave and half free." When the last resort of war had been tried and the South surrendered, then the bond of a common citizenship was sacredly signed in the blood of almost countless thousands, and henceforth there was to be no sectional division, and former sectional lines were to disappear utterly. This was the issue and judgment of fate and war.

HAPPY RECONCILIATION.

I am proud to say on this day that as a whole, and under all the conditions in a broad view, the South has nobly kept the bond made at Lee's surrender. The reconciliation has been as complete as it has been glorious in the happy circle of our redeemed Union. The bravest are the tenderest, and the heroes are the daring in all battles of war or peace, and the stately heroic Lee and his able generals, as a whole, fully accepted the bond of blood and at once entered upon the era of peace worthy in a citizenship, surcharged with the sentiments of lasting peace and concord. But it remained under God for the Spanish-American war to come to bring into line side by side the sons of veterans of the North and the sons of veterans of the South, marching to the music of the Union, under the Stars and Stripes, and commanded by former wearers of the gray and the blue, to bring forth full accord between old foes, and thus secure a common sentiment of American patriotism. This meeting on the ground where the brave men fought and fell during the fierce onsets of the blue and gray in the sixties but illustrates the lesson of peace and concord of the nineties I have just mentioned. I trust this great gathering of former veterans of the armies of the South and of the North will bear lasting fruit as an object lesson of fellowship as American citizens, one that stands for a strong and high civilization.

SOME IRRITATING MEMORIES.

I am aware that both in the South and in the North there linger irritating memories over the great war. It is not strange that this should be so; it would be strange, indeed, if it were otherwise under all the remarkable circumstances surrounding the mighty conflict and victory. There is some misunderstanding, no doubt, even yet, both in the North and in the South, over the conditions and proprieties which the surrender made binding upon all.

The South fought under their Stars and Bars, and the principles these stood for, with a heroism unsurpassed in battle record, and when they laid down their arms in surrender all they fought for went down with their silenced guns in an unquestionable settlement and decision of all the issues involved. The Confederacy passed into history as a dead and gone effort to "found a new nation" on American soil, and its furling flag should have no place in public view or parade henceforth. Old things have, indeed, passed away with us, and the new promises of present and future growth in all that makes a nation happy and free, as well as wise and truly great, should be as the "pearl of great price" to every soul in our dear land.

I do not like to hear the term "rebels" and "traitors" applied now to the former foes of our Union, for it seems to me that men who volunteered to face death in the hell of battle did all that honest men could do to prove their loyalty to principle and duty, as they saw it from their point of view, duty, and principle. When they yielded to the fate of war, and accepted the new destiny of the nation, they stood upon a common plane of American citizenship, flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone, and Americans all; and I do not believe we should ask ex-Confederates to admit that they were wrong or traitors in the service they honestly rendered the Southern Confederacy. I know of no higher test of love of country than that of periling one's life for his ideals of law, justice, and liberty. Under this view it would follow that a final settlement of our sad and bloody differences should forever end all harsh recriminations regarding the great war. What I am anxious to see is the disappearance of all unworthy reminders of the terrible conflict, and the culture of present unity and righteousness over all the Union.

A COMMON CITIZENSHIP.

There can now be but one ideal of American citizenship, one Stars and Stripes, one bulwark of future national glory, and one line of patriotic teachings for all and by all. In this view the keeping alive of sectional teachings as to the justice and rights of the cause of the South in the hearts of the children is all out of order, unwise, unjust, and utterly opposed to the bond by which the great chieftain, Lee, solemnly bound the cause of the South in his final surrender. I deeply deplore all agencies of this sort, because in honor and in chivalric American manhood and womanhood nothing of this nature should be taught or tolerated for an instant. The facts are that one of two things is true—first, all the issues of the South were surrendered to the Union, or, second, the war for the preservation of the nation and the freedom of the slave and the end of the cause of contention was a failure. The whole world acknowledges that the final victory of the matchless Grant was complete, and that the South lost and the Union won.

Recently I visited the Southern States in my capacity as commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, and from the opening to the close of my official visitation I received the warmest and most cordial welcome, both from ex-Confederates and ex-Union veterans and comrades. Here, in this beautiful city of Atlanta, the hospitable gates were opened wide, and a camp of Confederate veterans came in a body to meet me, and I shook each one by the hand as they slowly marched past in two ranks. I was touched to tears by the pathetic scene. The memory of other scenes and other times came back to me, and I could but contrast the fierce onsets of foes on bloody battle lines to the blessed hand grasps of peace. At Dublin, in Texas, a deputation of ex-Confederates and comrades met me, coming 20 miles by rail to escort me back to their town, and we were welcomed by the mayor and officials, and a salute was fired in honor of the occasion. At a banquet held that evening the majority present were members of the Confederate camp at Dublin.

A TOUCHING INCIDENT.

I shall never forget the thrill that one ex-Confederate's speech sent through my soul. He said that he served in the Confederate army all through the war, and at its close his heart nearly broke under the burden of final defeat. He almost doubted the providence of God, as in tears and agony he laid down his arms. But the travail of soul passed, and he communed thus to himself: "I have done my duty as I understood it; have periled all and lost all in the conflict, and now, under the laws of fate and of war, I fully accept the new destiny. I have a Confederate flag I followed in the war, and once a year I bring it out and display it in my home. I have made provision in my will that when my time comes to go, three ex-Confederates and three ex-Union veterans shall bear my body to the tomb; and I have directed that my Stars and Bars shall be wrapped about my body so that I may sleep the sleep that knows no waking within the folds of the banner I followed so often in battle; and this is to be the disposition of the emblem of our lost cause in my family—buried out of sight forever!" And he closed one of the most eloquent speeches to which I have ever listened as follows:

"Now, sir, I am an American citizen, as loyal as you can be to the Stars and Stripes, and to the new destiny of this Union. I would willingly peril my life in its defense, and my children are taught to live in the present and for the future, zealous for the fullest realization of the fruits of the victory won by the armies of the Union, and faithful in all that inspires sentiments of loyalty and strength in the institutions of our now happy reunited nation."

THE RIGHT DOMINATING SPIRIT.

This is the spirit of wisdom, as it seems to me, which should dominate all American hearts in the living present of this closing year of the greatest century in the life of man. Let us cherish our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country, and labor to secure the raising of the Stars and Stripes over every schoolhouse in the nation, and to place common text-books within them in every way worthy of a great nation, as the only safeguard of future national development and glory. It cost the lives of a million men and untold sacrifice in suffering and treasure as the price paid for not wisely understanding each other, South and North in the sixties, and now the lamp of the Lord should be our guide along the ways of right and righteousness, within the circle of our great country, so as to be worthy of our birthright, bought with such a price, and where a union of hearts and a union of hands and the flag of our Union may be our watchword and defense forever.

BATTLEFIELD PARKS.

The battlefield parks which have been established in various parts of the country, dedicating to our posterity the sacred areas where were settled the momentous issues which caused the great war, are, I feel confident, one of the composing and wise agencies in the elimination of prejudices and enmities born of that unhappy period. I am earnestly in favor of this policy, and it is a new growth of the national spirit of true Americanism in which is embraced the sentiment that settled antagonisms should be fully accepted as of the past, and that the fields of carnage where valor

"Sung a music to the march of man"

should become the common center of the affections of the whole people. Such monuments will tell the story of a nation's sacrifices as nothing else

can. These will show what war means, and what it costs, and these mute monuments will teach coming generations the true glory and sublime of patriotism and the highest human endeavor. And more, the environments of these battlefields will make clear the lessons of reconciliation as the joint heirs of either side meet in glory and in joy to pay a tribute to the memory of brave heroes thus commemorated for all time to come. I am strongly in favor of expansion along this patriotic line of action, and national appreciation of the deeds of heroes, as worthy of the full confidence and support of all patriots.

A NATIONAL MEMORIAL DAY.

It seems to me that a national memorial day, falling on the last Sunday in May, would be a prudent and wise selection. It would bring to the association of Memorial Day a sacred memory day, the guardianship of the church, and the tender memories of families, societies, and veterans of all wars, each in their own way to pay tribute of flowers and tears to the memory of the dear dead. I would make it national in order that a common day of devotion might strengthen the sentiment of affection among the living, and it should fall on a Sunday to insure that peace and rest which the holy Sabbath should always command. If this national day and date are fixed upon, the distracting present accompaniments of Memorial Day in the form of boat races, baseball, and many forms of sport would not come in to mar the solemnity and change the original sacredness of this holy function of patriotism and affection.

The last Sunday in May would meet the broad requirements of flowers and season as well as any possible date, and but little difficulty would attend the change. The important object of so surrounding Memorial Day as to fix its beautiful sentiment in the affectionate remembrance and observance of coming generations is one of greatest moment; and it is believed that to have it invariably fixed on a Sunday would secure the desired result. The new custom of scattering flowers on the waters in memory of those who died on the sea or on ships is a touching memorial worthy of the widest extension and observation. Let us embrace all our dead in the loving circle of a national Memorial Day, and thus the soldier, the sailor, and the citizen would receive the tribute of flowers as the tender custom of decorating the graves of our dear more and more finds favor among our people.

RETURN OF CAPTURED FLAGS.

Much that was wise, with much irrelevant, has been said in the past, as well as in the present, about the return of captured battle flags. I do not see what real service agitation over this question will render the living veterans, either of the South or the North. They are a part of the dead past and of an issue forever closed. Many of the heroes who won or lost the colors of troop, battery, or regiment are beyond the reach of any action proposed with these relics of brutal war, and I do not know that there has been any demand made by those from whom flags were captured, or by those who captured them, for any action whatever to be taken regarding their present condition. After all the veterans of the sixties are at rest, the sons of veterans of the South and of the North can make any disposition they please of these emblems of departed significance, and without the slightest shock to the most sensitive or prejudiced mind. I am sure I voice the commanding sentiment of the veterans of the gray and the blue on this question when I say that silence is more desirable than agitation in connection therewith. On the great record of these years the history of unsurpassed heroism in capturing or defending these battle flags has an undying place. This monument to valor will never perish, but the crumbling flags will soon decay. Under these conditions, let us leave both as an undisturbed legacy of equal heroism to the future.

VETERANS OF THE BLUE AND THE GRAY.

This meeting is deeply pathetic to me, and no doubt to all who are present. It marks a broad fraternity of sentiment among reunited citizens of our great country. We can not fully realize what a vast national domain we have to hold and develop in the coming years. Eighty millions of free and happy souls, heirs of the greatest Government. Of all the people, by all the people, and for all the people; of all mankind, presents a power for good and for God unparalleled in human history. Our internecine battles of horrid war are ended, and the rule of righteousness should henceforth be our guide and inspiration. Let us go forward in loyal courage to fight the battles of peace as valiantly as we met the shock of battle on either side a generation ago, and in union and devoted citizenship remember that righteousness exalteth a nation. If we do this, our last days will be our noblest, and the future will bless our final victories, when, as Abraham Lincoln prophesied, "this land shall be the home of 600,000,000 free and happy people."

SURSUM CORDA.

And now in the farewell that I must speak, under this fair sky, now so peaceful, once filled with the thunderclouds of war, let me urge you men of that heroic past which we all remember; women of that day of desolation and of sacrifice, when we all laid our dead away; yes, let me implore you that we, the Americans of this our land—our land of one flag and of a common glory—that we, forever united, turn from all that grieved our poor, bruised hearts, and, facing the future, teach all our children that this, under God, is their land—a land to be ruled in righteousness and kept for enduring liberty!

Mr. Speaker, we have before us grave duties to perform in connection with the franchise in a number of the States of our Union. A full investigation without fear, prejudice, or favor by the Census Committee of this House should at once be undertaken. This course is demanded by the plain requirements of the Constitution and in the broad interest of all the people. Worthy statecraft is the strong arm of just governments. We can not as a great free people permit wrongs to be done to the humblest of our citizens without endangering the liberties of all. Judge Emory Speer, of Georgia, in a recent speech at Atlanta, took this broad and statesmanlike ground upon the constitutional rights of the white man and the negro:

We should resort to no questionable expedient. We should accord to ignorance or worthlessness of whatever color no hereditary right to the privileges of the elector. That "Wisdom, justice, and moderation" which proudly adorn the blazonry of the Empire State of the South should guide our councils in all the deliberations so vital to our future. We should hazard no unconstitutional risk in prescribing the qualifications of the elector. We should hew to the constitutional line, let the chips fall as they will. This is manly. This is the part of honest men engaged in a great and arduous struggle to secure to themselves and their posterity the blessing of lawful popular government. Then in truth will the people of the South enjoy their own again.

Ex-President Cleveland lately uttered these prudent and wise words:

This is a time for sober thought, tolerant language, and fraternal counsels. * * * Above all things, there should be a manly renunciation and avoidance of undue sectional control.

These expressions were not made specially regarding the negro race in the South, but the reference to "sectional control" bears a striking relation to all the causes leading up to the "undue sectional control" to which he was referring. If Congress does not show its courage and statesmanship in resolutely dealing with the issue under discussion, a grave peril surely confronts us. Congress has a sworn duty to perform in connection with the present apportionment which it can not in wisdom or justice ignore or disobey. Lack of stalwart courage is always ignoble in the swirl of the carnage of battle or in the no less important conflicts over constitutional rights.

Reason, law, and statesmanship are the resources of the highest civilization, and we are face to face with issues and sworn duties that will test our best inspirations of loyalty and liberty. In the year 1809 two children were born who became great historic figures in history—Abraham Lincoln and William Ewart Gladstone. Each lived to win universal reputations of great renown. One represented England and the other the United States. Slavery existed in British possessions and in the United States when these two men appeared, at the age of 22, to take up their public life work. When Abraham Lincoln fell a martyr to liberty, and his great heart ceased to beat for the downtrodden and oppressed, slavery had been swept away wherever the union jack and the Stars and Stripes floated.

Gladstone led the culture of safe statesmanship that secured the abolition of slavery in his great country without war. Lincoln was forced to lead his country through "seas of blood" before the final doom of slavery on our own soil was sealed; and this became irrevocable with the surrender at Appomattox.

These two pictures are worthy of careful study by us all under present pressing demands of right and duty.

Where there is a common and patriotic effort to find the way of justice and law, the way of law and justice can always be found. When a great constitutional duty is disregarded and no just means are tried to right apparent wrongs, liberty is endangered and citizenship dishonored.

As to what will or can solve the negro problem, Booker T. Washington argues, in the August number of the North American Review, that "education" will solve it. In his views, which are presented in a way to command general respect on broad educational lines, there are practical considerations of great wisdom. He holds that the sort of education needed is that which "begins in the home and includes training in industry and habits of thrift, as well as mental, moral, and religious discipline, and the broader education which comes from contact with the public sentiment of the community in which one lives."

WISE SAFEGUARDS.

This is cogent reasoning and prudent counsel. A reasonable and impartial property qualification and a just and safe educational test are not objectionable, providing that the same are applied to all citizens alike, and that each is free to cast his ballot in peace and have it counted in righteousness. Unless this is the rule then any political action that leads to the disfranchisement of American citizens on account of race or color is not only unconstitutional, but fraught with grave peril to American justice and citizenship. The following plank in the platform of the Philadelphia Republican national convention clearly sets forth the policy of the Republican party upon this subject:

It was the plain purpose of the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution to prevent discrimination on account of race or color in regulating the elective franchise. Devices of State governments, whether by statutory or constitutional enactment, to avoid the purpose of this amendment are revolutionary, and should be condemned.

I have the honor to represent in part, measured by its wealth, its population, and its commanding elements of national strength, the greatest State in the Union. I am proud to say that we have manhood suffrage, based upon the plain provisions of the Constitution. And every son of its soil, and all naturalized citizens, under just local regulations, can cast their votes in perfect freedom. The statistics prove that its citizens exercise the right of franchise in full measure, and in a manner worthy of the honor of our State and the safety of our electorate.

Reference has been made to restrictions in a number of States of our Union, where educational and property qualifications are enforced to regulate the suffrage.

I am frank to say that our experience in New York, on the whole, leads me to believe that universal suffrage is a good system in all its bearings. In time of war every citizen between the age of 21 and 45 is enrolled. When a draft is ordered, the names are placed in the revolving wheel, and the choice of chance, when a name is drawn, settles the claim of the Government to the services of its citizens in its defense. Now, it seems to me that when a citizen can legally be taken thus drastically from his home and all he holds dear in life to become a soldier in war, amid all its dangers and sacrifices, that he is entitled to a vote in periods of peace as a constitutional right, even though he is poor or is unable to read and write. And in this view New York opens the way to the ballot box to all its citizens.

Under our broad constitutional provisions we have no trouble in meeting the fullest constitutional tests. We can discuss full enfranchisement with a clear conscience and present a satisfactory compliance with constitutional prerogatives. Wherever State restrictions lower the electorate and practically disfranchise American citizens, then the plain mandate of the Constitution should be enforced and the representation made to conform to the constitutional requirements. I would apply this test to any State and to every State, without the slightest impartiality whatever, because the qualifications of electors should be uniform in all the States of our Union. I believe this policy is one that would secure general respect for the Constitution and justice for all State and national interests, and all would participate alike in the privileges of citizenship by means of the ballot. Education will more and more eliminate ignorance, and thrift will certainly follow a better culture of manhood.

I can not understand how any patriotic and loyal American citizen can object to a just constitutional rule that a restrictive franchise should be followed by a lowering of the representation based thereon. Any objector to a negro vote should fairly refuse to benefit by this uncast ballot. Before the great war a slave stood for three-fifths of a vote in the Southern States. Now each negro of lawful age stands for five-fifths in voting power—a full vote. If he is disfranchised, then a gain of two-fifths in voting strength is added to the electorate as compared with ante-bellum days, thus securing a larger representation and yet denying the right to vote. Where all are American citizens, under sacred constitutional provisions, such discriminations should be promptly swept away by an aroused public sentiment of justice and law over our whole country, or those communities or States which bring about other conditions should not be permitted to profit thereby in the matter of representation.

This is a good time to rise to the demands of constitutional justice. The opening of a new century calls for a higher development of all the moral and political forces entering into our national life. We have it in our power as citizens of a Republic unrivaled in history to so act in peace and concord as to secure the blessings of the highest civilization of all the ages of mankind in the near future. Above all, the problem is one concerning Americans alone, and the exercise of patient statecraft and the loyal defense of constitutional rights under God will eventually bring about a happy solving of an issue which now seems so perilous in many ways. The spirit of our great martyr President should animate and inspire us all. We should be quick and proud to "quit ourselves like men" in the face of the present race problem. If we do, with reason and without passion, the true light of safety and justice will surely bless all our borders.

When President Lincoln was walking through the streets of Richmond, Va., April 4, 1865, some negroes knelt at his feet and thanked him for their freedom. The President's noble reply was as follows:

Don't kneel to me; that is not right. You must kneel to God only, and thank him for the liberty you will hereafter enjoy. I am but God's humble instrument, but you may rest assured that as long as I live no one shall put a shackle on your limbs and you shall have all the rights which God has given to every free citizen of this Republic.

In this spirit of worthy American freedom let us defend the constitutional rights of every American citizen, and so prove "Equal to the present, reaching forward to the future." Above all, let there be no "color line."

The Negro Problem of the South.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, January 8, 1901.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 12740) making an apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Twelfth census—

MR. GROSVENOR said:

MR. SPEAKER: The problem of what to do with the colored man is becoming intensely interesting to the people of the whole country, and, taking advantage of the order of the House, I propose to submit an article from the Forum of last August, written by myself, which clearly expresses my views. It is as follows:

THE NEGRO PROBLEM IN THE SOUTH.

If I for one moment believed it possible that in any contingency I could have any feelings other than those of absolute fraternity and cordial good will toward the people of the South, I would not put pen to paper upon the subject-matter of this article. Indeed, I feel as much anxiety for the welfare of the Southern people—for the growth and development of their splendid possibilities in all directions—as I do for the welfare of the people of any

other section of the Union. All my animosities of the war period have been long since lost sight of. So much, then, for the feeling with which I enter upon my present task.

It may be stated as an unquestionable proposition that the foundations upon which our Government rests differ widely from those of other nations. The authority of our Government is founded upon the consent of the governed; and this is not a phrase to be criticised and trifled with when the subject-matter of discussion relates to the people of the organized States of this Union, nor even when it applies to the people of territory acquired by conquest or treaty, although the application differs in various cases.

It is not necessary to enter upon the field of discussion which has grown out of some of our foreign relations. Let us, then, start out by accepting the proposition that all men in the United States have an equal right to be consulted about those matters of the United States Government which, by any possibility, can affect them. To take from members of a free government their individual right to participate in that government—a right guaranteed by the constitution of the State in which they live, and long recognized as undeniable—would be to act in opposition to the doctrine so tenaciously adhered to by a large body of men in Congress during the recent session, namely, that it is the consent of the governed alone that gives power to the governing body.

That there is a movement on foot, fully developed and already largely executed, having for its aim and object the disfranchisement at the polls of a body of men in the South will not be denied by any candid writer or thinker. It is not alone the hope of those who are thus moving to exclude ignorance and vice and incompetency, but it is their hope to make it impossible by law that the rights of citizenship shall any longer be exercised by the colored men of a majority of the Southern States. Already, in the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina, constitutional amendments have been adopted which, by their operation, will exclude from the privilege of voting a very large minority, if not indeed a majority, of the people of these States.

No intelligent, fair-minded man will deny that it is the purpose of the organizers and promoters of this movement to make it impossible for the colored man to vote in those States. Nor did any gentleman of the South, in the recent reference to the matter in Congress, deny that the manifest intention is so to shape legislation as to have it operate unequally upon the white and the black. Indeed, the gentlemen of that section justify it, and that justification will be discussed here briefly. But, to make it a little plainer and more emphatic, it is intended that offices of every kind shall be held by white men alone, and that the colored men shall have no voice in choosing who of the white men shall hold the offices.

The colored men of the South are to become serfs, persons in, but not of, the Southern States. Stripped of all power of resistance by the use of the only weapon that a free man has in a republic, he would be subject at once to the will of his white masters; and it may be well argued that his condition in that case would be worse than it was in slavery. Then he had certain claims upon his master; then his master had great interest in him, at least in his physical welfare. Now the master would have no interest in the colored man whatever. He would be simply his master, and would be under no obligation to protect him under any circumstances whatever.

In order that this argument may be considered fair and equitable, there should be no misunderstanding as to what the movement in the South has for its ultimate object. Great art has been used to make it appear that the disfranchisement contemplated in the new formula of political rights is applicable alike to the white and the black; and, literally speaking, that is true. But before assuming the responsibility of this article the writer interrogated a number of gentlemen distinguished in political and social life in several of the Southern States as to whether or not it would be just to charge that the movement was intended to disfranchise the black and preserve the white from the operation of the new system.

Without exception they answered: "It would be perfectly fair, for such is the real purpose." It will not be forgotten that a distinguished Senator openly declared that purpose in the United States Senate recently, nor will it be forgotten that a number of the Representatives of the South in the House manfully defended their attitude upon this question on the ground of their determined hostility to negro domination.

If anything were lacking to show that the real purpose is to disfranchise men upon the basis of color, an examination of the new provisions of the constitution would settle the question affirmatively. To illustrate: Two men present themselves at the polls, one a black man and the other a white man. Upon examination as to their educational qualification, they both fail in like degree. But the interrogator at once puts to the white man this question: "Was your father a voter in 1860?" The answer is in the affirmative, and he is permitted to vote. A like question to the colored man reveals the fact that his father was not a voter at that time, and he is at once turned out as a political pariah. Here we find the whole matter of the amendment disclosed.

Now, what have we here? One of the most un-American, undemocratic provisions that can be imagined—hereditary right of suffrage—a species of class legislation utterly at variance with the American spirit. The questions of fitness and of the benefits of intelligence to flow to the State are entirely discarded.

What will be the effect of this movement upon the South, and, incidentally, upon the whole country? It is the principal object of this article to point out that the danger to the people of the South is far greater than it is to the other people of the United States. The history of the world proves that men who have tasted liberty know its value and resent its removal. Not only will the negroes show their resentment, but they will cease to produce anything of value for the body politic in which they reside. They will add neither to the material welfare nor to the intellectual growth and strength of the State.

It may be argued at this point that during the civil war the slaves of the South remained at home and cared for the families of the men at the front. That is all true, and does not argue against this proposition. They had never been free men, and they did not know what the right to vote meant. They have tasted something of liberty, and no men enjoyed citizenship more deeply than did the enfranchised slaves of the South. It came to them as an unexpected boon, and they valued it beyond comparison.

No people ever developed the elements of good citizenship with such remarkable rapidity as did the colored people after emancipation. After two hundred years of bondage they were liberated, and civil and political rights were accorded to them. The inference that social equality had not been a part of the transition, that distinctions of race and color still existed, was at once accepted by them; and it has been a world's wonder how faithfully the colored people have observed these lines of distinction.

And, more than that, take the whole country over. It has been a world's wonder that they have sought after and obtained such a degree of education as they are shown to have acquired. Figures would be tiresome in this connection; but their institutions of higher learning, their devotion to the public schools, and their deep interest in all that relates to the uplifting of their race have marked them as a most peculiar and interesting race of people.

It will be a marvel if disfranchisement does not stop all, or practically all, progress in this direction. In such event what has the colored man to look forward to? Simply a lower stage of degradation. He knows that if this

scheme is put into operation his children and his children's children, for all time to come, are to be in practical slavery. Why should he struggle? Why should he educate himself and his children? He will retrace the steps he has taken toward good citizenship much more rapidly than he has advanced. It is the history of the world, and there is no escape from the blighting effects.

But it is said, in answer to all this, by the men of the South, men of character, men of intelligence, "We will not live under colored government." Very well. Assume this to be a proper position to take, and who will deny it? What State in this Union is under colored domination to-day? There are in the Union a number of States having a greater voting population of colored men than of white men; and yet not one of those States is dominated by the colored race.

Take the State of Mississippi—no colored man in Congress. There is no more danger of colored domination in one of those States than there is that intelligence will find itself prostrated by ignorance, enterprise by sloth. This is not a just argument. It never was. There is no such thing as negro domination, and there is no danger that there ever will be. The colored man as he becomes intelligent grows in virtue and love of country; and he is as likely to vote for the white man as for the black man, and much more so, as has been demonstrated a thousand times.

I fear that the just historian of these hours of apparent political evolution in the South will be compelled to write that this effort toward the destruction of the franchise of the colored people was a play of partisan politics and not of sincere patriotism. I fear this; it may not be so, but that is my anxiety. For more than thirty years now, about one-third of a century, the colored man has been a voter. During that time the Southern States have flourished beyond all comparison.

The property, the prosperity, the happiness, the good government, the education, and the civilization of the Southern States have increased in a ratio most gratifying; and all this has been accomplished with the political rights of the colored man unassailed. Why should this new suggestion force itself in here? Why should it be insisted upon that this race, which has suffered so much, so long, and so patiently, and made such rapid strides toward a better condition, shall now be disfranchised?

The white man of the South at the end of the war found himself living where this great colored element resided. It was one of the burdens. It could not have been expected otherwise. It could not have been imagined by the people of the South that in case of failure they would bear no burdens growing out of a war. They were compelled to bear burdens, not the lightest of which, in their estimation, was the carpetbag government. But they have gotten rid of that, and every Southern State is now under the control and influence of its own people.

The question now presented to the people is: "Will you let well enough alone, or will you hazard the future?" Can not the people of the South be patient while the transformation is going on? Is it because of the ignorance of the colored man alone, or is it a prejudice because of his color? If it is the first, there is an excuse for it; if the second, it is without excuse. The remedy should be patience, hope, discharge of duty, and the education of the black men of the South. If I may be permitted to say so, the remedy lies also in the education of the white men of the South, to see to it that the colored men do not get ahead in the great race of life.

It is to be hoped that the people of the South will halt at the position now assumed, and that no other States will enter upon this unfortunate process. The forthcoming census of the United States will disclose approximately the situation in the South. We shall learn the number of voters, comparisons will at once be made, and agitation will at once become manifest in American politics. It will be regrettable. It will be a sad day for the country when there shall come a new political issue which shall take sides and be organized for political contests along geographical or sectional lines.

These are merely outlines, brought to the notice of the reader for the purpose of suggesting thought and study, and with the hope that the gravity of the situation will be met by calm judgment and patriotic action.

CHARLES HENRY GROSVENOR.

Will the colored man remain in the South as a slave, for that is what he is coming to? I know it is boastfully stated here on the floor that great sums of money are being lavished on the education of the colored children of the South, but is there not danger that the smell of the blood of the overthrown manhood of the colored man will further stimulate the threats to enslave him? Is there not danger that he will become in fact, if not in law, a slave? His disfranchisement is for the purpose of crippling his power. Why not take another step and cripple his power by removing the means of education from him? Is not this being done?

Within forty-eight hours after boasts were made on this floor of the vast sums of money that North Carolina was expending for the education of the colored man alike with the white man, three bills were introduced in the North Carolina legislature to strip from the colored man all participation in the common schools of the State except such as arises from the taxation of his own property. It is in the power of the Southern States to do it, and is there any doubt that it is the purpose of some? I do not; I hope not; I pray that it is not. I fear it is.

If this develops, the result will be to place the colored man of the South in a worse position than he was in slavery. He will be, to all intents and purpose, the burden bearer of the labor of the South, with no claim for support in case of sickness, no claim to be housed and fed by his master, but he will be a servant of servants. His position will be that of absolute political, educational, and industrial slavery. Can this be? It looks as though it were coming. Every turn of the windlass binds the shackles closer and closer.

I copy a suggestion from some Southern newspapers, which shows what must apparently occur. I cite the Raleigh Post, of which I know nothing, but which talks without hesitation:

EXODUS OF BLACKS FROM NORTH CAROLINA.

The disfranchisement of the negroes of North Carolina has its economic as well as its political aspect. The electoral privilege, the right of citizenship, is the most highly regarded of all that a State can confer. Even men who are negligent in the use of it arise to arms when it is sought to take it from them. That the blacks of North Carolina should bitterly resent the robbing them of the right they have heretofore possessed is natural, and that this resentment should take the form of removal from the State is a sequence that was to have been anticipated. It is not probable that the blacks will

better their material condition by any exodus from the State, but they will find consolation in the fact that they have thereby preserved the one privilege which men prize next to life itself.

That there is a considerable exodus of the blacks from North Carolina since the passage of the constitutional amendment is shown by several statements. Royal Daniel, secretary of the convention of Southern commissioners of agriculture, writes to the *Atlanta Journal* that "the negroes are on the move." The *Observer*, of Charlotte, N. C., says: "The negro is a failure as a voter, but he has his uses as a farm hand, and there is no doubt that the farmers in some sections of the State are sorely put to it for help to pick their cotton crops. It is right to exclude these people from the ballot, but it is suicidal to drive them by bad treatment out of the State."

The *Raleigh Post* tells the truth about the matter when it says: "If this exodus keeps on, these land owners and farmers will be in a worse condition than they have been since the war, and will have no one to thank for it save the arrant demagogues whose reckless imbecility is only equaled by their unblushing and unselfish aspirations."

The exodus can only be stopped by one means, the restoration to the blacks of the rights which have been taken from them. If this is not done, the State will join the list of decadent States, such as Nevada, for which there seems to be no future.

The exodus of the colored people of the South, which apparently will begin and go on, and must, in the very nature of things, would be a national disaster, not only to the people of the South, but to the people of the North, and yet it seems to be their only remedy, and with the vast lands in the Indian Territory and Oklahoma, and with the vast unoccupied lands in Missouri and Kansas, it looks as though the drift of the colored labor of the South would shortly ensue and go forward.

I have no feeling in this matter but that of deep and unqualified regret and sympathy for the South, and I do not undervalue the burden they are bearing; but I believe they are overestimating it, and I feel that their efforts to relieve themselves of the difficulty are pressing them closer and closer and that the burden will become greater and greater. Patience, hope, fair play, and justice, I believe in the long run would have relieved all this trouble.

Reapportionment.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JESSE OVERSTREET,

OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, January 5, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 13740) making an apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Twelfth Census.

Mr. OVERSTREET said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Availing myself of the privilege to print extended by the House in this debate, I desire to submit, for the information of members interested in the subject of legislation strengthening the gold standard, an argument favoring the exchangeability of the coins of the United States, which has been prepared by the executive committee of the Indianapolis monetary convention. In view of the successful operation of the act of March 14, 1900, further legislation in harmony with that act will surely operate equally as well. This is made clear by the argument referred to, which is as follows:

MAKE THE GOLD STANDARD UNASSAILABLE BY MAKING ALL FORMS OF MONEY INTERCHANGEABLE WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION AGAINST SILVER.

The only way to make the gold standard unassailable is to provide for the free exchange by the Treasury of all standard coins issued by the United States, for each other, without discrimination, at the option of the holder.

This will insure the maintenance of the gold standard, because the holder of any other form of money can exchange it, at his option, for gold.

It will insure the parity of all silver money by making it as good as gold. It will make no discrimination against silver, because it can be obtained on demand in exchange for gold or paper.

It will not add any burden to the Treasury beyond that imposed by its present obligations, because, all forms of money being treated alike, there will be no discrimination in the presentation of money for redemption.

It will prevent any discrimination in the payment of money into the Treasury, and will, therefore, prevent the drying up of the stream of gold in times of panic, which flows between the banks, the clearing houses, and the sub-treasuries in times of business activity.

It will establish the gold standard so firmly and plainly that international transactions will be attracted to the United States, and this country will take her proper place in the contest for the commercial empire of the world.

The opposition to making silver, paper, and gold interchangeable is based upon the belief that it would add to the quantity of gold obligations of the Government, and, therefore, to the burden imposed upon the Treasury gold reserve. While this proposition seems plausible at first glance, examination will show that it is not in accordance with the facts.

The Treasury now redeems in gold on demand any part of the issues outstanding on December 1, 1900, of these forms of money: \$346,081,016 in United States notes, \$63,448,000 in Treasury notes of 1890, and \$254,007,370 in gold certificates. National bank notes are redeemable at the Treasury in legal-tender

notes, which are themselves redeemable in gold, so that practically the amount of bank notes outstanding on December 1, 1900, which was \$332,232,330, may be said to be redeemable in gold on demand at the Treasury of the United States. So long as the Government holds out the offer to redeem any part of this sum of about \$996,000,000 in gold coin on demand, ample opportunity is afforded for persons desiring gold to obtain it from the Treasury. It can not add in any appreciable degree to the ability to obtain gold from the Treasury to extend the offer of the Treasury so as to pay gold for silver. Silver is already paid for gold upon demand, and demands for silver dollars in exchange for gold are frequently made during the crop-moving season. Perfect equality between the two metals would, therefore, be established by making them interchangeable at the Treasury.

The proposition that silver dollars should be exchangeable for gold coin at the United States Treasury, at the option of the holder, would not change existing conditions in any material respect except in the increased degree of confidence inspired among the public in the character of silver money. The United States now maintain a system of redemption of silver as the equivalent of gold through the acceptance of silver for public dues. The receipts of the Treasury, including postal receipts, for the fiscal year 1900 were \$699,595,431. This sum is in excess of the whole volume of standard silver dollars coined or issued, which was reported by the Treasury on December 1, 1900, at \$500,061,162. The Treasury, therefore, constantly holds out the offer to accept the whole volume of its standard silver money within less than one year as the equivalent of gold by receiving it for public dues. The option lies with the taxpayer to pay silver if he prefers to retain gold. The Government can not escape this liability for redemption of silver through the public dues without enacting legislation making silver no longer receivable, which would discredit a part of the standard money of the country, possibly send silver dollars to a discount, and introduce grave disorder into the monetary system.

The power to secure the redemption of silver through its payment for public dues was actually availed of to a very large extent from the spring of 1891 until the spring of 1895. The payments for customs at New York were made largely in gold certificates for ten years from the issue of such certificates in the autumn of 1882.

Gold payments by the Government at the clearing house practically ceased in July, 1892, except for a brief period in the autumn of 1893, when the cash balance of the Treasury became so reduced that it was necessary to employ, for ordinary expenditures, the gold held for the redemption of the United States notes. The payments into the Treasury for customs dues began to be made in the summer of 1891 largely in United States notes and Treasury notes, the latter being then regarded by the banks as less definite gold obligations than United States notes. The customs payments at New York in July, 1891, were \$11,303,169, of which only 15.1 per cent was in gold coin and gold certificates, 49 per cent was in United States notes, 27.4 per cent in Treasury notes, and 3.5 per cent in silver certificates.

The proportion of Treasury notes rose in July, 1892, to 42.3 per cent and of silver certificates to 15.5 per cent, while gold certificates and gold coin together fell to 13.9 per cent. The percentage of gold certificates paid for customs never, until the autumn of 1899, reached 10 per cent of the total payments after August, 1892, and fell below 5 per cent after March, 1893. The proportion of silver certificates paid reached 51.1 per cent in December, 1893, and did not fall below 45 per cent during any of the first eight months of 1894. Silver certificates remained a large element in payments for customs until February, 1898, when they had fallen to 31.2 per cent of total payments. Gold coin began to reappear in customs payments in November, 1897, when the proportion was 5 per cent, and gradually rose to 52.7 per cent in April, 1898, and 78 per cent in September, 1898. The proportions since then have been even larger.

The following table shows the changes in the proportions of gold coin, gold certificates, legal-tender notes, and silver certificates paid for customs dues at New York under different conditions for representative months:

Customs payments at New York.

Month.	Gold coin.	United States notes.	Treasury notes.	Gold certificates.	Silver certificates.
January, 1890	0.1	4.6	-----	92.5	2.8
July, 1890	0.1	2.5	-----	95.3	2.0
January, 1891	0.1	4.1	6.2	89.5	2.1
July, 1891	0.2	49.0	27.4	14.9	8.5
January, 1892	0.1	15.0	14.5	66.1	4.3
July, 1892	0.1	26.4	42.2	13.8	15.5
January, 1893	0.0	42.1	33.2	8.9	15.8
July, 1893	12.5	55.6	15.0	4.6	12.3
January, 1894	17.0	11.2	11.8	0.6	59.3
July, 1894	0.0	23.4	17.1	0.0	59.4
January, 1895	0.7	53.6	5.0	0.0	40.6
July, 1895	0.2	67.1	1.9	0.2	30.5
January, 1896	0.0	47.4	2.7	0.0	49.9
July, 1896	0.0	53.1	0.7	0.0	46.2
January, 1897	0.0	42.6	9.2	0.0	48.2
July, 1897	0.6	63.8	2.7	0.0	27.9
January, 1898	6.8	54.1	1.2	0.0	37.9
July, 1898	59.9	22.6	0.4	0.0	17.1
January, 1899	78.4	6.9	0.2	0.0	14.5
July, 1899	85.3	5.3	0.1	0.0	9.3
January, 1900	5.5	3.0	0.0	76.5	15.0
July, 1900	1.8	6.3	0.0	78.5	13.4
November, 1900	2.5	5.1	0.0	88.5	3.9

These figures show that the forced redemption of silver through its payment for public dues is a resource which was promptly availed of when discredit was thrown upon the paper and silver money of the country. Gold practically ceased to be paid for public dues from 1894 to 1897, while silver was poured into the Treasury in large amounts. The situation changed in 1898, and gold, including gold certificates contributed during the year 1900 from 80 to 90 per cent of the customs payments. These figures show that the payment of silver for public dues is as effective a resource or draining the Treasury of gold as the direct presentation of silver for gold. In fact, the use of this resource would probably be much greater, even in case of distrust of silver, than direct presentations at the Treasury for exchange. A law which abolished discriminations against silver, by making it in some sense a gold certificate, would put an end to any tendency to employ it for obtaining gold from the Treasury.

If silver were presented largely to the Treasury for exchange for gold, it would be presented chiefly through the banks. The banks have carried so

little silver since the enactment of the silver laws of 1878 and 1900 that the amount they have held at any one time would be a trifling factor in raising the Treasury. The banks might accumulate more silver if it were raised to equality with gold, but they would be less disposed to discriminate against it by presenting it to the Treasury. They found legal-tender notes enough to present for redemption when the gold export movement was at its height in 1893 and 1894, because they got rid of silver as rapidly as possible for public dues. Under a system which made no discrimination between different forms of money, more silver might be held by the banks and more might be presented for gold than would now be possible, but it would simply take the place of other money which might be thus presented, and would not increase the total demand upon the Treasury.

How trifling is the amount of silver which could be presented by the banks for exchange for gold under present conditions is apparent when the amounts they have carried at the dates of different reports to the Comptroller of the Currency is examined:

Silver in national banks.

Date.	Silver dollars.	Silver certificates.
December 10, 1893.....	\$7,530,135	\$34,776,253
May 4, 1894.....	7,489,931	41,580,654
December 19, 1894.....	5,354,778	29,743,446
May 7, 1895.....	7,245,537	28,519,277
December 13, 1895.....	6,984,382	25,878,323
May 7, 1896.....	7,285,043	31,512,287
October 6, 1896.....	6,721,871	28,057,095
December 15, 1897.....	7,500,247	31,752,596
May 5, 1898.....	8,100,544	35,316,796
December 1, 1899.....	8,012,695	32,700,654
April 5, 1899.....	8,246,929	32,193,899
June 30, 1899.....	8,361,974	32,578,638
December 2, 1899.....	7,569,649	26,356,766
February 12, 1900.....	8,798,952	34,132,389
April 26, 1900.....	9,053,551	44,049,035
June 20, 1900.....	9,293,232	44,437,981
September 5, 1900.....	8,782,306	45,243,559

Most of the silver held by the banks is a necessary part of their small change. The distribution of the small amounts given above among 3,600 national banks would afford an average of less than \$15,000 for each institution. How widely this small amount of silver was distributed over the country is indicated by the following exhibit of silver held by the national banks at the date of their reports to the Comptroller on September 5, 1900:

Location of banks.	Silver dollars.	Silver certificates.
New York City.....	\$90,523	\$11,167,153
Chicago.....	440,737	5,296,950
St. Louis.....	30,307	1,613,826
Other reserve cities.....	1,931,450	15,333,156
Country banks:		
New England.....	444,161	2,259,425
Other Eastern States.....	1,285,734	4,767,548
Southern States.....	2,030,702	1,804,199
Middle States.....	1,710,684	2,233,118
Western States.....	594,959	574,133
Pacific States.....	208,049	192,042

This table shows that the whole power of the national banks of New York City for raising the Treasury by means of silver is only about \$11,000,000, and that in employing their silver for this purpose they would deprive themselves entirely of their silver dollars and largely of their small notes.

The figures of silver holdings of the national banks indicate that the silver certificates in circulation are largely scattered among the people for current transactions and could not be withdrawn from circulation by any process except that of paying a premium for them. One of the resources relied upon by the Monetary Commission, and embodied in the existing law, for preventing the presentation of silver for exchange in gold is the limitation of silver certificates chiefly to denominations of \$1, \$2, and \$5. There can be little doubt that this limitation will still further diminish the tendency of silver to accumulate in the banks and will keep the silver money absorbed in active circulation among the people. When heavy payments of silver certificates for customs dues took place at New York in 1893 and 1894, a large proportion of the certificates used were in large denominations.

The presentation of any form of money for gold at the United States Treasury would be practically limited to the demands of the foreign exchanges if the gold standard were established and properly fortified by law. This demand must be met by the Treasury under the existing currency system, and it makes little difference in the ultimate effect upon the Treasury whether it is met by the presentation of one form of money or another for gold. The banks have the option of furnishing gold from their own supply under the existing system, but they have also the option of declining to furnish it, except by the presentation of some form of United States money for exchange at the Treasury. The largest foreign demand for gold in any fiscal year was in 1893, when the net exports were \$37,500,463. There were net exports in the fiscal year 1891 of \$68,130,057, and in the fiscal year 1896 of \$78,884,882.

It is a question whether, in all these cases, the export of gold was not stimulated by distrust regarding the metallic standard and by the pressure of a redundant and inelastic mass of Government paper upon the volume of the circulation. Assuming, however, that the maximum export of gold indicated for the fiscal year 1893 was a normal movement of the foreign exchanges, there is no device under existing conditions, while the Government continues to issue redeemable paper money, for preventing the imposition of the burden upon the Treasury gold reserve. The question whether the burden shall be imposed upon the Treasury or shared by the banks is largely optional with the banks. They are likely to share the burden when gold is plentiful, out their ability to throw it upon the Treasury when gold is in demand can not be greatly impaired by any device regarding the Government currency, except its retirement or the suspension of gold payments. The adoption of a system making all United States money interchangeable and equivalent with gold would tend to limit the maximum demands upon the Treasury for gold to the needs of the foreign exchanges.

River and Harbor Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JACOB RUPPERT, JR.,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, January 12, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUPPERT said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not desire to discuss the river and harbor bill from a partisan standpoint or in a spirit of either criticism or laudation of the work of the committee. No committees in Congress perform more arduous labors or more important work than those which guard the expenditure of public funds. Importance is always relative. To the member who represents a district in which there is an unnavigable stream that could be rendered navigable by the expenditure of money, the appropriation for that stream is naturally very important alike to the member from that district and to his constituents. The money which is expended belongs to the people of the United States and not to the people of any particular section. This being true, it is important that the expenditures be so distributed as to render the greatest possible good to the greatest number.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, the stress of business which has to be transacted by the Rivers and Harbors Committee. I realize that some people must of necessity be disappointed. I realize also that it is but natural that some appropriations be made which might not be deemed as wise as some others which were refused.

It would be impossible for appropriations to be made in direct ratio with the benefits to be derived from the improvements, but such a ratio should not be entirely lost sight of in considering these appropriations.

The United States has entered upon what is practically a new era. The conditions of the world's commerce have changed for the better so far as our foreign trade is concerned, and if no mistakes are made the growth of the United States in its trade relations with foreign countries must continue to be rapid for some years to come.

It is important to provide for the coastwise trade and the internal rivers by proper appropriations, and the appropriations for these purposes contained in the present bill are liberal. In fact, it has been argued upon this floor that the appropriations for the lake ports and the Mississippi River are much too little. This is a question which I have no desire to discuss, nor do I wish to criticize a single appropriation made by this bill. I only want to call attention to the liberality of the appropriation made for the benefit of river and lake commerce, in order to give my approval to the principle of upbuilding this important branch of our domestic trade. But while I approve of liberal appropriations for these purposes, I submit that it is even more necessary that those harbors which accommodate the ships engaged in our foreign-carrying trade be made as nearly perfect as possible. In our foreign-carrying trade the railroads can not assist the water, but all of the business must be done on the sea. It is but natural that foreign ships seek the best harbors. They seek those harbors that are most safe, where the conditions are least onerous, and where the facilities are greatest.

The harbor of New York, from which more than one-half of all our imports and exports are unloaded or loaded, and where ships of all nations seek to enter into our foreign carrying trade, has had a good deal of attention at the hands of Congress, but it has been one of the least expensive harbors of any of the great harbor of the world. There has been less money expended upon the harbor of New York in proportion to the commerce of their harbor than has been expended upon any harbor in the United States upon which any expenditure has been made. There has been some good work done there. There has been some of the finest engineering in the world done there. That harbor, if completed in accordance with the plans of the engineers, would be justly a source of national pride and admiration. Not only does one-half of our entire foreign trade find its home in New York Harbor, but it is the greatest coastwise harbor in amount of commerce in the world to-day.

I am not an engineer, but I have been informed by those who ought to know that had the money already expended upon New York Harbor been made available at one time and the work been prosecuted diligently and without cessation, all of the improvements needed could have been made without the expenditure of another dollar. Whether this be true or not, it is certainly true

that much more could have been accomplished than has been done.

This is so short-sighted a policy that it is remarkable that it has ever obtained in the Government work on public improvements. Admittedly, one of the most important measures ever devised for the improvement of the New York Harbor is that of the canal to connect the Hudson River with Long Island Sound. In 1876 the attention was called to this scheme, and Congress thoroughly examined into it. It was found to be a work of the utmost importance, and one which presented no serious difficulties, and which could be completed at a moderate cost.

Congress made appropriations from time to time, but always in such amounts that the work could not be pushed to completion. They tinkered at that canal for seventeen years. It could have been built in three years. It is not yet completed. It is completed just far enough to show the absolute necessity for it, and not far enough to render it of substantial benefit. I introduced a resolution on January 4, 1900, concerning this matter, asking for an appropriation of \$1,175,000, the work to be completed within thirty months. No report has been made upon this important matter and the people of New York will be very greatly disappointed. The people of the entire United States would be disappointed if they could realize the benefits that would be derived from the successful completion of this work.

Without in any way intending to be captious and without any desire to criticize the Rivers and Harbors Committee, I wish, as a business man representing a business constituency upon the floor of this House, to enter an objection to the present policy of holding down appropriation bills by making appropriations too small to accomplish the purpose for which they are made, in order to benefit more communities. It would be better to put \$10,000,000 in any one river or harbor, if that would complete the work, than to put the \$10,000,000 in fifty rivers and harbors and have none of them completed when the money was expended.

It seems to me that business prudence would dictate that nothing be undertaken unless it was to be completed as rapidly as possible. By the policy of piecemeal appropriations the benefits of the first appropriations are counteracted and rendered null by damages to the work by the time the second appropriation is made. In all cases a part of the money is thus absolutely lost, while in some all of it is lost.

Up to the present time the United States has expended on its rivers and harbors during the past thirty-five years the sum of \$450,000,000. There are few, if any, of these rivers or harbors upon which the work has been so completed that no further work is necessary except that of maintenance. This money, if expended upon business principles, would have made one of the finest harbors in the world upon each of the coasts of the United States, would have improved a number of intermediate harbors, and would have made a ship canal out of the Ohio, Missouri, and Mississippi rivers. Under the policy that has been pursued none of the rivers or harbors have had the money that they ought to have had. This bill carries about \$60,000,000, and when that \$60,000,000 is expended there is not a river nor a harbor which will not be in need of appropriations.

Had I asked for a small appropriation for the Harlem Canal, I would probably have obtained it; had I obtained it, the money would have been lost. While I do not assert nor believe that all of the money appropriated by this bill will be uselessly expended, yet I do believe that had this same money been put in one-half of the rivers and harbors it would have effected a saving to the Government of several million dollars and conferred ten times the benefit. And in saying this I do not discriminate in favor of any of the improvements named in the bill. If they are all equally meritorious, it would still be the best policy to finish half of them, if we have not enough money to finish them all, before putting a dollar into the other half.

The committee recognized this principle in their appropriation for Buttermilk Channel in placing that as a continuing contract. The Buttermilk Channel is one of the most valuable improvements that could be made in New York Harbor. The commerce affected amounts to about \$375,000,000 a year. The appropriation was asked for by the municipal council, Cotton Exchange, New York State Chamber of Commerce, New York Board of Trade and Transportation, Maritime Association of the Port of New York, New York Produce Exchange, the Manufacturers' Association in New York, and the Coffee Exchange.

Three of the important lines have their piers along the river which this improvement affects, and more will be established there. The importance of a thorough investigation of the needs of the ports of New York can not be estimated. The Harlem canal I have already spoken of would to a very considerable extent relieve the congestion of trade along the rivers of New York, and that congestion has begun to be so great that something must positively be done to ameliorate the conditions which prevailed there.

The city of New York has grown more rapidly and more substantially than any other of the great cities of the world. The

port of New York is now first in the amount of commerce when both foreign and coastwise trade are considered.

The clearances from the port of New York are over 8,000,000 tons a year, or one-third of those of the entire United States. One-fourth of the total tonnage of registered vessels is registered in the port of New York.

The great cities of Europe depend for their business largely upon their foreign trade. New York has a larger domestic trade than any other city in the world. It is therefore at least abreast with London, Paris, and Berlin. It is a city of which every American ought to be proud. It has not the features which separate it from the rest of the country as is Paris separated from the rest of France in the minds and hearts of the French people. It is distinctively American, and will always be American. The people of the United States would be glad to see all improvements in the harbor of New York that would be necessary to make it the best harbor in the world.

The census of the United States when completed will reveal the fact that the growth of the country during the past ten years has been remarkable. It will show that notwithstanding the great increase in population, and therefore in the consuming capacity of our people, our imports have not materially increased, while our exports have doubled. This increase in exports has been a uniform one in all classes of products, and our merchants as well as our manufacturers have competed successfully with those of Europe. We not only feed the world, but we clothe and supply it with all classes of necessities and luxuries.

This condition has not been brought about by any party, any creed, or any class. It has been brought about by the indomitable pluck and energy of the American people. The condition of trade in Europe and in the Orient made the growth of American enterprise possible, but to the American business men is due the credit of taking advantage of those conditions. It is in behalf of these business interests that I speak to-day. No question of sectionalism, of favoritism, or prejudice should be allowed to enter into this matter. We have established the foundation for a foreign business in comparison with which our present business will appear but small.

There have been many millions of dollars invested by conservative men upon the faith they have in the future. Without counting any of the unfortunate and illegal speculative trust enterprises or capitalization which is not based upon actual cash paid in, it is a conservative estimate to say that from three to five thousand million dollars have been invested within the past ten years in New York City alone in order to build up our foreign trade. I do not mean that this money has been invested exclusively for the foreign trade, but it has been invested in such directions that its direct effect will be the upbuilding of our foreign commerce. The business interests of the country have in times past troubled Congress but little. It has been but a few years since professional men alone appeared before the committees of Congress. They now realize that in this they made a mistake, and the best business men in the country freely inform Congressmen concerning the business needs of the country. While I do not believe that these men should be listened to to the exclusion of all other men, I do believe that the petitions of commercial organizations and the statements of men with large interests should be listened to very attentively, and unless they are dictated by self-interest the demand should be granted.

If the people of New York believed that by conservative effort they could secure an alleviation of the congestion of commerce now in the harbor of New York, every man in that city would ask that this be done. The River and Harbor Committee in the present bill has done much for the harbor of New York. It has made appropriations for East River, Harlem River, and the very greatly needed improvements of the Buttermilk Channel. The committee has treated the members representing the districts of Greater New York with kindness and courtesy, and has given what undoubtedly seems to them liberal appropriations. They have given so much that we have asked that it would seem ungrateful for me to criticize their action in not giving all that we ask. I only do so because I believe that the interests of the country demand that a new system be adopted with relation to our harbor improvements. I believe that the leading harbors should be very carefully examined, not with a view to patching them up, or to see how little money they can get along with, but with a view to ascertaining all that can be done toward developing them, and what amount of money can be profitably expended upon them. A million dollars might be put into a harbor and be practically lost, where \$3,000,000 could be expended at a large profit to the country.

The principal condition now operating against New York Harbor is the congestion of commerce. There are places where the channel is not sufficiently wide; there is an insufficiency of available water front. To anyone who visits New York, even though he may not be acquainted with the shipping business, the fact that the rivers are in places overcrowded is evident at a glance. There are delays, especially with tramp vessels, in the loading and unloading of freight. These delays are costly to the vessels and to

the shippers. In many respects New York has a magnificent harbor, and the disadvantages I speak of can be overcome at a very reasonable expenditure. Much of the trouble would be obviated by the completion of the canal from the Hudson River to Long Island Sound.

There has never been an adverse report from the Government engineers as to this canal, and I am satisfied that every time it has been considered by Congress it has been considered favorably. The appropriation is not in this bill. I think that the reason it is not in this bill is that New York Harbor already had as large a share as the committee thought advisable in order to satisfy those members who were interested in other harbors. I can not blame a member for wanting to secure as large an appropriation as possible for legitimate work in his own district, but I think the time has come when we ought to consider this question upon a broad national basis, and not from a local or sectional standpoint. We want harbors, and we want the very best harbors that our coast will permit. We want those harbors where they will best further the interests of both domestic and foreign trade.

It is not necessary that every seacoast town should have a deep-sea harbor, but it is necessary that those harbors which are most used should be made as nearly perfect as possible in order to facilitate and build up our trade. In order to accomplish this with the least expenditure it is necessary that the improvement work upon a harbor which is to be improved should be pushed to completion as rapidly as possible and should be made as thorough as possible. Then, when the contract is completed, the harbor is completed. The only further expense necessary is for maintenance. I do not believe that we have to-day, in permanent improvements, the value of 25 per cent of the total amount which we have expended for improvements intended to be permanent. If we change the policy from our present one for one more broad and liberal, we will make larger immediate appropriations, but our expenditure during a series of twenty or thirty years will be much smaller than under the present plan, while the benefits derived will be vastly greater.

I would be glad if the Rivers and Harbors Committee would during one Congress have continuous meetings and occupy the time in preparing an exhaustive report upon the conditions and possibilities of the harbors of the country. If the conditions are worse than the possibilities are attractive, then there would be no wisdom in making expenditures, while, if the possibilities are great, conditions, no matter how adverse, can be overcome. If our river and harbor improvements should be thus systematized the effect upon both our coastwise and foreign trade would be beyond computation. If the present system is continued and members obtain appropriations because of their personal popularity or because of return favors in the passage of other bills, it can not be expected that the river and harbor appropriations can ever be otherwise than what they are now—frequently a source of absolute waste of money. I am not in sympathy with the attack upon the committee or upon any individual members.

Under the present system these expenditures are probably as equitably distributed as it would be possible to make them. But it ought not to be a question of equitable sectional distribution. What the Government is buying when it invests its money in improvements of this character is facility for commerce. The best investment is that which facilitates commerce. If an investment does not facilitate commerce it is lost. The best way to facilitate commerce is by either improving facilities where commerce exists or making facilities where commerce fails to exist only by reason of the absence of such facilities.

It is a matter of fact that one-half of the commerce of the United States has its habitat in the port of New York. It would naturally be supposed, therefore, that if only one perfect harbor was to be provided that harbor would be in New York. It would be supposed that the New York Harbor would have everything done for it that could be done in order to develop the possibility of its commerce. The next harbor to be completed ought to be the next harbor in importance. Judging from what I know of the New York Harbor I should think that the amount of money carried in the present bill would be sufficient to complete all of the work that would be possible to do on at least ten harbors so situated that they would facilitate business upon the Atlantic coast, the Gulf coast, the Pacific coast, and the Lake coast.

As it is now, no one is fully satisfied, because the work is not fully completed on these improvements, while if enough was appropriated to complete the specific work it would take but a few years to complete improvement of enough harbors and rivers to supply the needs of the entire country.

I give expression to these thoughts for the reason that as a business man, representing a business constituency, I believe in securing the greatest possible amount of benefit for the least amount of money, and I do not believe in wasteful expenditure. As a business man I would, as a measure of economy, complete the improvement of one property, and not use my means in doing partial and temporary work upon all of my property at the same time. [Applause.]

River and Harbor Bill.

SPEECH OF

HON. NICHOLAS MULLER,

OF NEW YORK.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, January 15, 1901.

On the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. MULLER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The paragraph which has just been read, calling for an appropriation for Arthur Kill, or Staten Island Sound, for a 21-foot channel from Kill van Kull to Raritan Bay, is a very meritorious one, and ought to pass without any amendment. According to the statement of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, this improvement was commenced in 1874, and calls for a channel 21 feet deep and 300 to 400 feet wide. It is proposed to do the work by dredging and diking, and the estimated cost is \$696,000.

The preliminary examination for this work was ordered in the river and harbor act of March 3, 1890, and has been reported upon favorably and an appropriation incorporated in the river and harbor bill now under consideration by the House. It is estimated that over 9,000,000 tons of commerce, consisting largely of oil, coal, brick clay, etc., passes through this channel annually, and is increasing.

The channel has been repeatedly dredged to 14 feet, but through the peculiar effect of the tides it soon becomes obstructed again. The length from Kill van Kull to Raritan Bay is about 15 miles, and for about 9 miles the depth is 21 feet. It is now proposed by this appropriation to make it all 21 feet, which will require dredging for about 6 miles.

The proposed improvement will be of a permanent nature and of a lasting character, and the cost of maintenance very light. The value of the improvement will be inestimable to commerce, as it will also add largely to the value of the water frontage, thus increasing the taxation of the property benefited thereby. Part of this improvement is located in the district I have the honor to represent, and it has been indorsed by the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce and the business interests affected by the same.

It is without question a work which is absolutely necessary for the increasing commerce of the country, and the improvement is recommended by the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers.

In conclusion, I desire to say that this work being of such a nature as will recommend itself to the favorable consideration of every member of the House I trust there will be no opposition to the appropriation and it will be allowed.

River and Harbor Bill.

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES R. MANN,

OF ILLINOIS.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, January 12, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. MANN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can not hope to equal, either in interest or information, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] who has just taken his seat. It will be a distinct loss to the House and to the interests of the commerce of the country when that distinguished gentleman leaves his place upon the floor of this House as a Representative from Mississippi. [Loud general applause.]

I take it that no member of Congress who has ever sat either in this body or in the Senate has been so well posted upon and has so thoroughly understood all of the problems relative to the navigation and preservation of the Mississippi River as the gentleman who has just entertained the House. It is not very much that I know about the navigation or commerce of the Mississippi River, though I represent a locality which is interested to a considerable degree in the commerce of that river.

The city of Chicago has expended already about \$40,000,000 in the construction of a canal which cuts through the divide separating the valley tributary to the Mississippi from that tributary to the Great Lakes. That canal has been constructed partly for the purpose of obtaining a supply of pure water, but at least one-half the cost of the canal has been expended in order to make it of suitable size for navigation by deep-draft vessels.

Sooner or later the Chicago Drainage Canal will be connected by a canal, yet to be constructed, with the Desplaines and Illinois rivers, so that Chicago will be connected through direct water transportation with the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico.

The river and harbor bill of two years ago carried an appropriation of \$30,000 to pay the expense of making a survey and estimate of cost for the construction of an 8-foot canal connecting the sanitary canal with the Illinois River.

I had hoped, Mr. Chairman, that this bill would carry an appropriation to commence that improvement.

But some of the gentlemen who are interested in the commerce of the Illinois River Valley, as well as others interested in commerce going southward from Chicago and northward from St. Louis, have most earnestly urged that, instead of commencing the work on an 8-foot connecting canal, we first have a report from the Engineering Department of the Government as to the feasibility and cost of a canal 14 feet in depth. Although I do not believe myself in the practicability of a 14-foot canal, I have, in deference to those members of this House from Illinois who have so earnestly favored the project, withheld any objection to it; and this bill now carries an appropriation of \$200,000 for the purpose of making a thorough examination into the practicability and cost of constructing a 14-foot canal from the Chicago Drainage Canal at Lockport, Ill., to the Illinois River, and thence deepening the Illinois River and the Mississippi River to a depth of 14 feet from Lockport to St. Louis.

Personally I do not believe that a 14-foot canal will be of much, if any, greater value than an 8-foot canal; nor do I believe that a 14-foot channel between the mouth of the Illinois River and St. Louis is practicable or possible.

Below St. Louis it is practically impossible to construct or maintain a 14-foot channel at low-water mark.

It will be seen, however, from this statement that Chicago and the State of Illinois are vitally interested in the commerce of the Mississippi River and in the possibilities attending its navigation. The Government has already expended upward of \$40,000,000 for the purpose of improving the navigation of the Mississippi River, without counting the amounts expended by bordering States, municipalities, and individuals.

But the commerce of the Mississippi River is small and insignificant compared with another branch of commerce affected by the present bill, and in which Chicago and the entire Northwest are most vitally interested. I refer to the commerce of the Great Lakes.

When Jefferson acquired the territory west of the Mississippi and at the mouth of the Mississippi, known as the Louisiana purchase, in 1803, it was the well-nigh universal opinion that the products of the Mississippi Valley must find their way to other parts of the country and to the sea almost exclusively by way of the Mississippi River. But to-day the great lines of commerce in the country are from west to east and east to west, and the commerce on the Great Lakes has grown within a few years to a magnitude unappreciated by our people, and with a development so rapid that it is unparalleled in the history of the world.

Some of the gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to the pending bill have attacked with considerable bitterness the proposed appropriations for some of the harbors and channels upon the Great Lakes.

The city of Chicago does not consider that it has received full justice in the pending bill. At the proper time I propose to offer an amendment directing the Engineering Department of the Government to report to Congress upon the feasibility and need and the estimated cost of one or more turning basins in the North and South branches of the Chicago River. But whether that amendment shall be adopted or not, I shall be glad to vote for this bill, because, in my opinion, some of the improvements contemplated by it are of vast interest not only to the country and its commerce generally, but also to the particular commerce of the city of Chicago.

The city of Chicago has two great harbors. One is the Chicago River; the other is the Calumet River. This bill carries no appropriation for the Chicago River. It carries an appropriation of \$75,000 for the purpose of extending the present 20-foot channel in the Calumet River from One hundred and sixth street to One hundred and twenty-second street and for the improvement of that river up to and beyond Hammond, Ind. Of course, further appropriations will be required for this important improvement from time to time hereafter. Other appropriations relating to the Calumet Harbor will be made in the sundry civil appropriation bill in order to continue the construction of the great outer harbor at that point.

But notwithstanding Chicago does not receive a direct appropriation, it will not be without benefit by the passage of the present measure. Chicago is the gateway of the bulk of the commerce between the middle West and the middle East. Situated as it is at the southernmost point of western lake navigation, it occupies geographically a commanding position in the internal commerce of our country, akin to that occupied by New York City in relation to our foreign commerce.

Take, for instance, the grain trade. Chicago is the leading grain center of the country. The large proportion of the grain raised on the Western farms must pass through Chicago on its way toward the East or on its route to Europe.

The controlling factor in this grain trade is the navigation on the Great Lakes. The grain-carrying fleets going from Chicago to Buffalo increase considerably the price of every bushel of grain raised in our Western country. They cheapen the cost of flour and other food in every portion of the East. They enable us to maintain a profitable competition with Argentina and other foreign countries in the production of breadstuffs and other cereals.

The distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] has attacked, with his usual vigor and incisiveness, the appropriations carried by this bill for the Great Lakes, including the deepening and widening of the channel of the Detroit River. At the last session of Congress I listened with great pleasure to his remarkably exhaustive, entertaining, and instructive speech in behalf of the Nicaragua Canal bill which bears his name, and which proposes an expenditure of \$150,000,000, more or less, for the construction of that canal. But, Mr. Chairman, if the Nicaragua Canal shall be built there will not be so much commerce pass through it in five years' time as now passes in seven months of each year through the Detroit River.

Much or most of the commerce through the Nicaragua Canal will be foreign commerce in which this country has little interest. The commerce which passes through the Detroit River is our own domestic commerce, which is of vital interest to our country. And yet gentlemen who will propose to expend \$150,000,000 for the construction of a Nicaragua Canal, far away on foreign shores, object to the expenditure of a million or so for the improvement of a river close at home and of tenfold value to our own commerce.

I call the attention of the House to the fact that the amount of commerce between this country and foreign countries to-day is a little less than 30,000,000 tons each way, counting the tonnage of the vessels entering and clearing at the various ports; while the commerce carried in the year 1899 through St. Marys Canal amounted to 27,527,205 tons and the commerce passing through the Detroit River during the same season, as estimated by the Engineering Department, amounted to more than 40,000,000 tons.

Where in the history of commerce in the world is there so startling and striking an example as the history and growth of the commerce through the St. Marys River canals? By far the greater proportion of the commerce there passes through the American canal. And the total traffic through these canals in the St. Marys River was, in 1888, 1,567,741 tons. Year by year it has gradually increased until in 1899 that commerce amounted to over 27,000,000 tons, an increase in twelve years' time from 1,500,000 to 27,000,000 tons. Who can parallel its development in the history of mankind?

The day before yesterday, in the course of debate upon the floor here, a slight controversy arose between the gentleman from New York [Mr. ALEXANDER] and myself in regard to which of the two cities, Buffalo and Chicago, was the second port in importance in the United States. The fact that such a question arose at all is an illustration of the remarkable growth of commerce on the Great Lakes.

We in the inland portions of the country have been accustomed for years to talk and hear about the remarkable commerce of New York City, of Boston, of Charleston, of Galveston, of Philadelphia, and of many other seaport cities. And the popular impression of the people of our country is that the vast proportion of the commerce of the United States passes in and out of these great ports on the seaboard.

It is very natural that such an impression should prevail, because, of course, the import duties are usually paid at the point where the ship comes into port, and not a very large proportion of the goods imported into the country is sent in bond to the inland States. New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and the other great ports of the country are the places where the money is mainly collected for import duties. And some of the gentlemen representing those localities seem to have the impression that it is in their States that the great commerce of the country exists.

As a simple illustration of the comparative amount of our commerce upon the Great Lakes and upon the ocean let me call your attention to the figures given in the report of the Steamboat Inspection Service for the year ending June 30, 1900.

The number of domestic steam vessels inspected for the year ending June 30 last was as follows:

For the Pacific coast, 913 vessels, with a tonnage of 384,271.

For the Atlantic coast, 3,666 vessels, with a tonnage of 988,820.
 For the Western rivers, 985 vessels, with a tonnage of 143,958.
 For the Gulf coast, 615 vessels, with a tonnage of 99,252.
 For the Great Lakes 2,129 vessels, with a tonnage of 1,118,224.

It will be noticed that while the number of vessels inspected on the Great Lakes is considerably less than the total inspected on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, yet their tonnage is greater than the combined tonnage of all the domestic vessels on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. This shows not only that the commerce of the Great Lakes is greater than the combined coastwise commerce of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, but that the average size of the vessels engaged in the lake commerce is at least twice as large as the average size of the vessels engaged in coastwise commerce on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts.

Mr. Chairman, the total entrances of vessels engaged in the foreign trade at Boston for the year ending June 30, 1899, were 1,780, and the total clearances were 1,707, making a total of 3,487 vessels, with a tonnage of 4,002,543.

Boston Harbor has heretofore had appropriated for it more than \$4,000,000 by the National Government, and the present bill carries an appropriation of \$3,763,000 and provides for a channel 1,500 feet in width.

The entrances at New York for the same period in the foreign trade were 4,250 and the clearances 4,034, or a total of 8,304, with a tonnage of 15,203,756.

New York Harbor has had appropriated for it heretofore \$10,000,000, and the present bill carries an appropriation of \$2,100,000, and provides for a channel 2,000 feet in width.

The entrances at Philadelphia in the foreign trade for the same period, were 1,028 and the clearances 1,088, or a total 2,116 vessels, with a tonnage of 3,346,808.

Philadelphia has received before very large appropriations, and received in this bill \$3,000,000 for the purpose of making a channel 600 feet in width in the Delaware River.

The entrances in the foreign trade at Charleston Harbor for the same period were 109 and the clearances 80, or a total of 189 vessels, with a tonnage of 219,225.

Charleston Harbor has received appropriations heretofore of \$4,487,500, though in the present bill it receives only the modest appropriation of \$60,000.

The entrances in the foreign trade at Savannah Harbor for the same period were 320 and the clearances 321, or a total of 639 vessels, with a tonnage of 668,079.

The appropriations for Savannah Harbor have been heretofore \$6,387,000, and the present bill carries an appropriation for that harbor of \$1,000,000.

The entrances in the foreign trade at Mobile Harbor for the same period were 535 and the clearances 555, or a total of 1,090 vessels, with a tonnage of 789,678.

The appropriations for Mobile Harbor have been heretofore \$4,218,630, and the present bill carries an appropriation of \$400,000.

The entrances in the foreign trade for the same period at New Orleans were 1,066 and the clearances 1,022, or a total of 2,088 vessels, with a tonnage of 2,871,031.

Without referring to the immense appropriations which have been made heretofore in the interest of the New Orleans foreign commerce, it is sufficient to say that the present bill carries an appropriation for the improvement of the Southwest Pass of the Mississippi River of \$3,500,000, and that this improvement is sought for solely in the interest of the foreign trade at New Orleans.

The entrances at Galveston Harbor for the same period in the foreign trade were 514 and the clearances 563, or a total of 1,077 vessels, with a tonnage of 1,788,141. The prior appropriations for Galveston Harbor have been \$8,478,000, and the present bill carries an appropriation of \$1,500,000, though it is proper to say that at least a portion of the present appropriation is called for by reason of the recent great disaster at Galveston.

The total number of vessels engaged in foreign trade entering at all of the ports on our Pacific coast for the year ending June 30, 1899, was 3,007, and the number clearing was 3,092, or a total of 6,099, with an aggregate tonnage of 3,266,585.

There have been appropriated heretofore several million dollars for the improvement of our Pacific harbors, and the present bill carries an appropriation of over \$2,000,000 more.

I do not complain of these appropriations. I do not doubt the advisability of the improvements contemplated by them. The increase in the size of the modern ship compels, in many places, the deepening and widening of harbor channels, as well as greatly decreasing the cost of ocean carriage.

But I see no reason why we should discriminate in favor of salt water and against fresh water. It is true that salt water is not drinkable, but that is also true of Chicago River water. We should decide these questions upon the basis of the amount and possibilities of commerce and navigation, and not upon the basis of the amount of salt in the water or whether the body of water is affected by the tides.

In the discussion between the gentleman from New York [Mr.

ALEXANDER] and myself with reference to the relative position of Buffalo and Chicago some figures were presented by the gentleman from New York, taken from the recent number of Commerce and Finance, which figures I may say are not accurate. This is the first year that that department of the Government has attempted to present any figures at all on this subject, and the method of collecting them at present is crude and unsatisfactory. But I will give to the House the number of vessels and tonnage entering both at Chicago and Buffalo during the last year and make a comparison, with the courtesy of the House, of these two ports and some of the seaboard ports.

The total entrance into the city of Chicago for the year 1900 was 8,422 vessels, with a tonnage of 6,945,170; and the total clearances from Chicago were 8,554 vessels, with a tonnage of 7,045,714. For the year 1900 these figures are given. I have not the figures for the last year of the city of Buffalo, but for 1899 the total entrances and clearances for the Buffalo port were 10,417 vessels, with a tonnage of 10,481,043. The total entrances and clearances in the Chicago Harbor district for the present year were 17,533 vessels, with a tonnage of 14,186,190. The gentlemen of the House can very quickly make comparison between these figures of 17,000 entering and clearing at Chicago and 10,000 entering and clearing at Buffalo, with a tonnage at Chicago of upward of 14,000,000 and at Buffalo of over 10,000,000, with some of the figures at the seaboard ports.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman permit me an interruption?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Where do you find the statistics you have just given?

Mr. MANN. The statistics relating to Chicago were sent to me by the collector of customs of the city of Chicago. The statistics relating to Buffalo I took from the last report of the Chief of Engineers of the War Department.

Mr. ALEXANDER. You speak of the district of Chicago, and that includes the Chicago River and South Chicago?

Mr. MANN. The first figures I gave in regard to the entrances and clearances at Chicago included Chicago and South Chicago, all of which is within the limits of the city of Chicago. The district of Chicago includes Michigan City, which has two or three hundred vessels a year.

Mr. ALEXANDER. And the figures given at Buffalo include simply Buffalo Creek?

Mr. MANN. I would not be certain about that, but my impression was—I may be mistaken about it—when I made the figures that it included Buffalo and Tonawanda Creek, the entire port of Buffalo. But I would not be absolutely certain about that.

Allow me to say in reference to the figures given by the gentleman from New York concerning the amount of commerce at Chicago, that my object is simply to correct an error in his speech as printed in the RECORD, and also to correct an error in his calculations. The speech as printed in the RECORD gives to Chicago a freight tonnage of about 2,300,000. I asked the gentleman whether that included both the shipments and the receipts, and I understood him to say that it did; he intended that it should include both. The fact, however, is that the document to which the gentleman referred, and from which he had taken the figures, gives to the city of Chicago from October 31 last a freight tonnage entering Chicago of 4,007,300 tons.

Mr. ALEXANDER. May I interrupt the gentleman again?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. ALEXANDER. In the tonnage of Chicago, as printed in my speech, there is a typographical error—not an error in my computation, for I have now in my hand the computation made at the time. The amount should be 4,167,950 instead of 2,132,691, as it appears in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the trouble with the gentleman's figures is that, as I understood him, they were supposed to cover both the receipts and the shipments.

Mr. ALEXANDER. They do.

Mr. MANN. The receipts of Chicago were over 4,000,000 tons, and the shipments were quite a number of hundreds of thousands of tons. So I think the gentleman was mistaken. I think he made, in some way, an error of figures.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think there is only a difference of 100,000 between us.

Mr. MANN. The difficulty is that the gentleman gave only the receipts, while he undertook to give both. I have not had time to figure up the shipments.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while this little controversy between the gentleman from New York and myself makes no difference whatever as to the amount of commerce of these two ports, it does call attention to the fact that there is a very vast amount of commerce at these ports, as well as at other ports on the Great Lakes. Chicago and Buffalo do not monopolize the lake traffic. There are plenty of other ports—Milwaukee, Duluth, Cleveland, Ashtabula, and many other places upon the Great Lakes—which are also of

great importance. As compared with these figures of Chicago and Buffalo, I give the figures of the foreign trade at Boston for the year ending June 30, 1899, being the last available statistics. In that year there entered at Boston 1,780 vessels, with a tonnage of 2,129,795; and there cleared 1,707 vessels, with a tonnage of 1,872,748, making a total of 3,487 vessels, with a tonnage of 4,002,543.

New York had in her foreign trade during the year ending June 30, 1899, 8,304 vessels, with a tonnage of 15,203,756, being a smaller number of vessels and only a trifle larger tonnage than the city of Chicago had during the present year.

And, Mr. Chairman, the tonnage emanating from Chicago is not by any means exclusively Chicago freight. Let it be remembered that the freight traffic upon the Great Lakes is almost entirely through freight—freight which is passing from one section of the country over a long distance to another section. The freight going from Buffalo does not emanate from Buffalo. The freight going through Buffalo does not stop at Buffalo. The freight going from Chicago does not emanate from Chicago, and a large portion of the freight coming through Chicago does not stop there.

Of the Chicago freight during last year there were shipped away from Chicago 132,681,731 bushels of grain. It might be rash to say that not a bushel of this grain was grown in Chicago, because Chicago has some agricultural territory. But the bulk of that grain was grown in the Western States. A large proportion of it was grown in the State of Iowa, a considerable portion in Wisconsin, much of it in the northern part of Illinois, and much of it in Nebraska and Kansas. The great bulk of that freight going through Chicago came from the Western States on its way east. And when it reached Buffalo it did not stop there; it went on east, either for export or for consumption by the mills in that part of the country.

It would be interesting to know the comparative difference between the cost of sending a bushel of grain from Chicago to New York City by the lakes and the cost by way of the railroads. Taking the last twenty years, the cost on the average of shipping by rail and shipping by the lakes from Chicago to New York has been about 7 cents less per bushel of grain by the lakes than by rail; and the average cost of sending a bushel of grain from Chicago to New York by the lakes is less than 5 cents a bushel, while by way of the railroad it is about 12 cents a bushel.

This difference, which goes to the benefit of the people who raise the grain, amounts to many million dollars a year. These people are interested not merely in the development of commerce at Chicago but in the development of the channels between these points. The Detroit River fixes absolutely to-day the size of vessels that can be used upon the Great Lakes. Whenever any method is adopted of deepening the water of the Detroit River there is an increase of the carrying capacity of the vessels which have been and are to be constructed.

The great bulk of the iron of the country comes from the Superior region. If that iron, either in ore or in manufactured products, had to be carried by rail, not, as it is now, by water, to the East, the cost of iron would probably be increased more than twofold. The decrease in the cost of iron products has been largely owing to the fact that they have discovered this wonderful iron ore in the Superior region and they have found a method of bringing it in this cheap way to Pittsburgh, to Ashtabula, to Cleveland, to South Chicago. Every dollar saved of that is of great benefit to the country at large. It is not for the interest of the locality. It is for the interest of the country, because it decreases the cost of the one article in use more than any other one article in the country.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have a little complaint myself in reference to the bill. As I said, the city of Chicago, at the Chicago River, or Chicago Harbor, does not receive a cent of appropriation in this bill. I do not ask for a cent of appropriation, but I did ask that the engineer at Chicago be authorized to make a survey and an estimate of the cost of a certain improvement there.

I hope the House will understand that the harbor of Chicago is the river. The Chicago Harbor is the Chicago River, a long, narrow, winding stream. During the busy summer months in Chicago—in June, July, and August—the entrances and clearances of vessels in this river amount to more than 3,000 a month. These are not small vessels, but large vessels. The entrances and clearances amount to more than 2,000 per month, a larger number of vessels entering and clearing out of the Chicago River than enter and clear out of any space of equal size on the face of the earth, and larger than anywhere enter and clear from a river of any kind.

This long, narrow, and winding river is so constructed that a moderate-length vessel entering it can not turn around. The great grain fleet that goes up the Chicago River to-day, down the South Branch, has to be pulled out backward by tugs, at great cost and at great danger. Several times a week during the busy season there are collisions of vessels, one with another, or of vessels with the bridges across the river. It is not the city of Chicago

that is interested in having this improved so much as it is the navigation interests.

The Lake Carriers' Vessel Association have made a special request that there should be constructed by somebody on the Chicago River what they call turning basins, at least two or three in the 15 or 20 miles of the river, where a vessel can go up and turn around and go out nose to the sea instead of backing out, as they do now. This is a matter of great importance. Why, I ask, should Chicago, with a commerce of more than 14,000,000 tons annually, receive no consideration, and Boston, with a commerce of 4,000,000 tons, receive out of this an appropriation of \$3,673,000?

Mind, I do not criticize the amount of the appropriation for Boston. I believe it is proper. But if Boston, with a commerce of 4,000,000 tons, ought to receive an appropriation of \$3,673,000; if New York, with a commerce of 15,000,000 tons, ought to receive an appropriation of \$1,800,000; if Savannah Harbor, with an annual commerce of 668,000 tons, ought to receive an appropriation of \$1,000,000; if New Orleans, with an annual commerce of 2,871,000 tons, ought to receive an appropriation at the Southwest Pass of \$3,500,000; if Galveston, with an annual commerce of 1,788,000 tons, ought to receive an appropriation of \$1,500,000; if Mobile, with an annual commerce of 789,000 tons, ought to receive an appropriation of \$400,000, certainly Chicago, with a commerce of 14,000,000 tons, ought to receive the right to have an engineer's estimate made.

Mr. OTJEN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. OTJEN. Are any of these appropriations for these various interests intended for the improvement of the inner harbor—the harbor inside the city limits?

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Chairman, the harbor of New York is almost entirely within the city of New York since New York was made Greater New York. All of the money that is to be expended there is practically expended within the limits of New York City.

A very large proportion of the money, if it is spent at all these places, is spent within the city limits. It is true these amounts are not spent upon rivers, because the harbors are not the rivers, except that at New York they call it channels. It is not the ocean; it is something else than the ocean. It is within the city limits. It is a proper expenditure of money. It is a proper improvement. It is a proper appropriation. I do not mean to criticize one of these. New York Harbor is entitled to every dollar of money that it can profitably use in the extension of its commerce and in making commerce easy. Every dollar spent in New York City in improving the facilities for commerce adds to the value of the grain in the Western States and a decrease in the cost of the material which the Western people use.

But there is no distinction such as the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors seeks to draw at times between one kind of water and another kind of water within the city limits. The Chicago Harbor can not be constructed in the lake. The National Government has spent on the Chicago Harbor, all told, about \$1,900,000, outside of the river, in the lake. We have a harbor there constructed originally at the suggestion of the engineering department under a plan to have the bridge and carrier business of Chicago done upon the lake front.

No modern freight vessel has ever gone inside of that harbor, and none ever will. The experiment has been a failure. They can not transact this business upon the lake front. The harbor of Chicago is the Chicago River, and as the Chicago Harbor it is entitled to consideration for the interests of navigation. There is no local interest that can do this. The city of Chicago can not make the improvement I speak of. The sanitary department, which has assumed control of the Chicago River, is not entitled to make the improvement. Only the National Government can make it, if it ever is made, and it is to the interest of the people owning the vessels and transacting the carrying business on the lakes to be able to turn their vessels around and go out bow foremost.

Mr. OTJEN. May I ask you another question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. OTJEN. Has there not been heretofore an appropriation made for improving the inner harbor of Chicago?

Mr. MANN. There was an appropriation of \$700,000 appropriated or contemplated. I think it has all been appropriated for the improvement of the Chicago River.

Mr. OTJEN. Let me ask you a further question.

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. OTJEN. Has that been expended on the river?

Mr. MANN. That has been expended on the river.

Mr. ALEXANDER rose.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Did you say \$750,000?

Mr. MANN. I said \$700,000.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I was thinking it was not quite so much

as that, perhaps about \$350,000. Possibly you are speaking by the official figures.

Mr. MANN. In the appropriation bill which was passed here in 1896 Congress appropriated \$50,000 cash and authorized \$650,000 more under the continuing contract system.

Mr. Chairman, I have stated heretofore the tonnage of the vessels entering and clearing at the city of Chicago, with the amount of their tonnage. Of the total of 8,247 entering at Chicago 7,035 vessels, with a tonnage of 4,989,118, entered at the Chicago River, and 1,202 vessels, with a tonnage of 1,956,062, entered at the Calumet River, in South Chicago, a portion of the city of Chicago.

Of the 8,250 vessels clearing from Chicago 7,017, with a tonnage of 4,976,964, cleared from the Chicago River, and 1,233, with a tonnage of 2,068,750, cleared from the Calumet River.

The total tonnage entering and clearing at the Chicago River was, therefore, 9,966,082, and the total tonnage entering and clearing at the Calumet River was 4,024,812.

The Calumet River Harbor at Chicago is of the lesser present importance of the two harbors, and yet the tonnage entering and clearing at that harbor is greater than the tonnage engaged in foreign trade entering and clearing at any port of the United States other than New York.

With such an immense commerce as this, why should the interests of Chicago not receive fuller attention in this bill? I do not make complaint against the River and Harbor Committee, and particularly I exonerate from any blame whatever the eminent member of that committee from the State of Illinois [Mr. REEVES], who has labored in season and out of season for the best commercial interests of our State and of the great Northwest.

I appreciate the fact that Chicago herself is largely to blame for the present situation. Not until after the present river and harbor bill had been practically agreed upon was any communication whatever sent to any member of this House from Chicago calling attention to the need of turning basins in the Chicago River, and although we have a strong association at home known as the Chicago River Improvement Association, I do not think any member of Congress from Chicago has received a line from that association concerning any needed improvements in the Chicago River.

Do not think from this statement that these improvements are not absolutely needed or that the river improvement association has not been actively at work.

We have been met with this situation at Chicago: The National Government, by the river and harbor bill of two years ago, fixed the navigable depth of the Chicago River at 21 feet. We have three tunnels under the river—one at La Salle street, one at Washington street, and one near Van Buren street. The La Salle street and Washington street tunnels were constructed by the city of Chicago, but are now used mainly by the street-railway companies. The Van Buren street tunnel was constructed and is solely used by the street-railway company. These tunnels fix the navigable depth of the Chicago River at the ordinary level of water at about 17 feet.

In addition to the obstruction to navigation caused by the tunnels, there are a great many bridges across the river, most of which are swing bridges with center piers. I have for many years been advocating the necessity of lowering the tunnels and removing the center-pier bridges. I have repeatedly said to the people of Chicago that this work was local in character and would not be undertaken or paid for by the National Government. At first those of us who took this position were scolded and derided at by the officials of Chicago, by some of our leading newspapers, and by practically all the Chicago River interests. I have repeatedly called the attention of the people of Chicago to the necessity of a local effort in removing these river obstructions, and have stated that no great improvement in river conditions could be obtained through the National Government until Chicago had commenced to make some progress in this direction herself.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that Chicago now appreciates her position in the matter. She has been hampered by lack of funds. The bonded indebtedness of Chicago can not be increased under the present constitution of Illinois, but Chicago has spent \$40,000,000 in the construction of her new drainage canal. The drainage canal trustees have assumed control of the Chicago River as a portion of that canal, and they are now proposing, as rapidly as is practicable, to remove the present center-pier bridges and to erect in their places what are known as bascule bridges, which open from the center outwardly. There is no doubt that within a reasonable time the center-pier bridges will disappear from the Chicago River, leaving a navigable channel wide enough for all practical purposes.

It is not to be believed that either the National Government or the local authorities will ever engage upon any such wild-goose chase as endeavoring to widen the Chicago River along its entire length. Chicago is also making proper effort to lower the tunnels. As I stated, the tunnels were used by the street-car companies. Something of a conflict is now going on between the city and the

street-car companies in regard to renewal of franchises. Until that question is settled it is natural that the street-car companies should object to the expense involved in the lowering of the tunnels. But the city has taken hold of the question and is making an effort to have it settled. Mandamus proceedings are now being pushed in the courts for the purpose of compelling the street-car companies to lower these tunnels so used by them to a depth which will conform with the navigable depth of the river as fixed by Congress at 21 feet.

Chicago is doing all that can possibly be expected of her in this connection. She has spent more money in the last few years in the construction of the new canal than any other half dozen cities in the country have ever spent in the improvement of water navigation. The results of this vast expenditure of money Chicago tenders to the nation.

But the changing of the current of water in the Chicago River and the rapid flow of that current from the lake toward the new drainage canal has been a great damage to navigation in the river.

The rapid current which is now compelled to pass through the Chicago River in order to furnish the necessary water to the drainage canal makes it both expensive and dangerous for tugs to pull loaded vessels out of the river backward. It is the duty of the National Government, in the interest of commerce on the lakes, and for the benefit of the commerce passing through Chicago from west to east and east to west, to construct such turning or winding basins as may be necessary to make the river navigation both cheap and safe.

I call the attention of the House to a petition which has been sent to me recently through the activity of Mr. James B. Gallo-way and Mr. J. G. Keith, of Chicago, who are two of the best friends the Chicago River has ever had. This petition is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Your petitioners, the undersigned, representatives of various marine, commercial, and transportation interests of Chicago, respectfully state that they are all deeply interested in the improvement of the Chicago River. That in compliance with the river and harbor act of March 3, 1899, amending the act of June 3, 1896, providing for a depth of 21 feet in the Chicago River, provided the tunnels shall be first lowered and center pier bridges be removed, your petitioners are now pressing for the removal of said obstructions and have reason to believe that this will be accomplished within a short time.

Your petitioners further respectfully represent that to make the river suitable for navigation by vessels requiring said depth of channel parts of the river must be widened and winding basins provided at suitable points along the channel.

Your petitioners are advised and believe that the best interests of lake commerce will be served by an expenditure of about \$2,000,000, to be expended from time to time under the supervision of the Government engineer at Chicago.

That to enable said engineer to act when the tunnels are lowered and center piers are removed, an appropriation at this time for the current year of \$500,000 is needed to purchase the necessary land and construct basins, so that the dredging of the channel may be proceeded with so soon as the obstructions are removed.

These turning basins are in great demand for the present commerce and can be made immediately useful.

Your petitioners therefore respectfully pray that your honorable body will appropriate the sum of \$2,000,000 as a continuing appropriation, of which the sum of \$500,000 may be made immediately available for the purposes hereinbefore stated.

This petition is signed by a large number of the leading business men of Chicago.

The people of Chicago believe that this petition ought to be granted by Congress, but I am not at this time asking so much of this House. All I ask now by the amendment which I propose is to follow the usual course in the making of public improvements by the National Government and have a report by the Engineer Department as to the need and expense of the proposed improvement.

Permit me to say, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion the expense of the proposed turning basins will not be anywhere near the \$2,000,000 asked for by the petition. In fact, I fail to see how it is possible at the present time for the Government to make an expenditure of \$2,000,000 on the Chicago River. But this petition was gotten up hastily, and I only present it for the purpose of showing the feeling of the people of Chicago in reference to the duty of the National Government to make needed improvements there. When the report of the engineer comes in, it will then be seen what is the estimated cost of the improvement which I am now urging.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the difficulty of amending the present bill. I know very well the danger to the bill if the chairman of the committee [Mr. BURTON] in charge of the bill consents to any material amendments to it. I am aware that he can not very well favor one amendment and one member of the House and refuse another amendment and another member of the House. I am aware that at this stage of the proceeding it is almost impossible to have proposed amendments considered upon their merits, but I appeal to this House to consider the magnitude of interests involved at this time. Chicago is the second city of the country. It has a population of nearly 2,000,000. It has a commerce of immense importance to those both east and west of her.

I shall, with the consent of the House, put in a statement

showing the amount and character of receipts and shipments by lake at Chicago during the year 1900. Most of this commerce is not trade local to Chicago. It is through commerce, in which the whole country is interested and which merely passes through Chicago on its way between the purchaser and the consumer.

Mr. Chairman, so long as I have the honor to remain a member of this House I shall continue to take every opportunity to impress upon this body the importance of the internal commerce of our country, the magnitude of the commercial interests on the Great Lakes, and the strategic advantage of Chicago in relation to our inland commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If the gentleman desires it, I have some little time to my credit, and the gentleman may take it if he wishes to.

Mr. MANN. I do not care to trespass upon the time of the House any further. I thank the House for the indulgent attention it has given to me. [Loud applause.]

Tonnage of the district of Chicago for the year 1900.

Entered at—	From American ports.		From foreign ports.		Total.	
	Ves-sels.	Tonnage.	Ves-sels.	Tonnage.	Ves-sels.	Tonnage.
Chicago River.....	7,035	4,760,252	146	228,806	7,181	4,989,118
South Chicago.....	1,212	1,928,889	29	27,173	1,241	1,956,062
Michigan City.....	207	51,391	None.		207	51,391
Waukegan.....	85	48,424	None.		85	48,424
Total.....	8,539	6,788,956	175	256,039	8,714	7,044,995

Cleared from—	To American ports.		To foreign ports.		Total.	
	Ves-sels.	Tonnage.	Ves-sels.	Tonnage.	Ves-sels.	Tonnage.
Chicago River.....	7,017	4,709,824	228	267,140	7,245	4,976,964
South Chicago.....	1,233	1,964,724	76	104,026	1,309	2,068,750
Michigan City.....	205	50,707	None.		205	50,707
Waukegan.....	80	44,774	None.		80	44,774
Total.....	8,535	6,770,229	304	371,166	8,839	7,141,395

Coastwise receipts—Chicago River, 1900.

Unclassified.....	packages..	3,103,825
Canned goods.....	do.....	679,848
Dry goods.....	do.....	483,731
Hardware.....	do.....	410,422
Groceries.....	do.....	742,707
Paper.....	do.....	420,221
Lumber.....	M.....	596,062
Shingles.....	M.....	78,150
Posts.....	M.....	9,575
Ties.....	pieces..	1,585,243
Poles.....	do.....	202,221
Wood.....	do.....	78,613
Bark.....	cords..	14,022
Fruit.....	do.....	2,525
Coal.....	packages..	547,038
Cordage.....	tons..	856,599
Hemp.....	bales..	119,302
Shoes.....	do.....	78,572
Salt.....	boxes..	358,906
Iron ore.....	bushels..	1,105,311
Leather.....	tons..	47,592
Furniture.....	bundles..	54,721
Manufactured iron.....	pieces..	123,806
Starch.....	tons..	13,682
Drugs.....	packages..	12,045
Caustic soda.....	do.....	80,017
Resin.....	do.....	13,617
Sugar.....	barrels..	10,248
Sirup.....	do.....	1,389,268
Flour.....	do.....	4,747
Potatoes.....	do.....	34,493
Cheese.....	bushels..	356,550
Coffee.....	packages..	16,570
Tea.....	do.....	236,218
Oil.....	do.....	2,418
Peas.....	barrels..	9,554
Beans.....	sacks..	113,466
Vinegar.....	do.....	7,235
Fish.....	barrels..	7,235
Nails.....	do.....	37,124
Copper.....	tons..	3,155
Sulphur.....	kegs..	49,636
Dried fruit.....	bars..	36,536
Plaster.....	barrels..	13,650
Cement.....	packages..	17,480
Whiting.....	do.....	26,500
Asphalt.....	do.....	42,629
Marble.....	do.....	27,500
Paint.....	blocks..	37,723
Wool.....	do.....	14,005
Green hides.....	barrels..	6,044
Soap.....	do.....	17,471
Liquors.....	packages..	89,360
Crockery.....	do.....	19,122
Wheat.....	do.....	9,053
Flaxseed.....	bushels..	223,900
Barley.....	do.....	121,000

Coastwise receipts—Chicago River, 1900—Continued.

Rye.....	bushels..	2,500
Grass seed.....	sacks..	3,190
Coastwise receipts, South Chicago—Calumet River, 1900.		
Unclassified.....	packages..	13,549
Lumber.....	M.....	27,344
Shingles.....	do.....	9,913
Posts.....	pieces..	34,800
Ties.....	do.....	164,137
Poles.....	do.....	34,530
Wood.....	cords..	842
Coal.....	tons..	126,795
Salt.....	barrels..	1,270,018
Iron ore.....	tons..	2,333,381
Manufactured iron.....	do.....	3,135
Plaster.....	barrels..	177,000

Coastwise shipments—Chicago River, 1900.

Unclassified.....	packages..	2,338,735
Flour.....	barrels..	2,276,080
Wheat.....	bushels..	16,624,416
Corn.....	do.....	45,104,086
Oats.....	do.....	17,232,045
Flaxseed.....	do.....	1,731,061
Rye.....	do.....	190,317
Barley.....	do.....	80,434
Grass seeds.....	sacks..	61,732
Mill stuffs.....	do.....	1,487,242
Gluten meal.....	do.....	79,719
Glucose.....	barrels..	68,736
Malt.....	sacks..	192,253
Oil cake.....	do.....	236,835
Spelter.....	plates..	237,890
Lead.....	bars..	29,895
Bullion.....	do.....	87,959
Copper residue.....	sacks..	1,655
Lard.....	packages..	76,923
Do.....	tierces..	71,046
Coffee.....	sacks..	21,875
Tea.....	chests..	20,337
Sugar.....	barrels..	154,871
Sirup.....	do.....	28,804
Groceries.....	packages..	553,350
Canned goods.....	do.....	291,323
Soap.....	do.....	177,021
Starch.....	do.....	67,611
Cured meats.....	do.....	12,592
Pork.....	barrels..	30,177
Beef.....	do.....	1,850
Oatmeal.....	do.....	46,936
Corn meal.....	do.....	4,446
Broom corn.....	bales..	4,396
Nails.....	kegs..	12,395
Manufactured iron.....	tons..	14,880
Potatoes.....	bushels..	4,063
Vinegar.....	barrels..	19,910
White lead.....	kegs..	29,178
Hides.....	bales..	112,743
Leather.....	do.....	26,858
Tallow.....	barrels..	26,229
Liquors.....	packages..	3,748
Salt.....	barrels..	18,534
Oil.....	do.....	11,330
Lumber.....	M feet..	488
Wool.....	bales..	14,918
Steel rails.....	tons..	3,632
Wire rods.....	do.....	3,661
Angle bars.....	do.....	621
Rags.....	bales..	8,907

Coastwise shipments, South Chicago—Calumet River, 1900.

Unclassified.....	packages..	51,077
Flour.....	barrels..	4,000
Wheat.....	bushels..	5,644,046
Corn.....	do.....	24,885,555
Oats.....	do.....	5,911,180
Flaxseed.....	do.....	50,400
Rye.....	do.....	50,000
Barley.....	do.....	312,000
Mill stuffs.....	sacks..	11,235
Oil.....	barrels..	116,730
Coal.....	tons..	1,850
Steel rails.....	do.....	1,555

Exports by lake from Chicago, 1900.

Commodity.	Carried in Amer- ican vessels.		Carried in fore- ign vessels.		Total.	
	Quan- tity.	Value.	Quan- tity.	Value.	Quan- tity.	Value.
Corn.....	bushels..	6,837,673	\$2,795,557	1,068,987	\$682,735	\$3,478,292
Barley.....	do.....	60,162	24,989		60,162	24,989
Flaxseed.....	do.....	135,532	223,676		135,532	223,676
Oats.....	do.....	704,116	179,711	330,100	81,450	1,024,216
Rye.....	do.....	189,485	103,139	21,304	11,291	201,789
Wheat.....	do.....	3,661,817	2,637,436		4,928,832	3,553,052
Flour.....	barrels..	20,800	80,757		20,800	80,757
Starch.....	do.....	4,075	19,052		4,075	19,052
Pork.....	do.....	3,175	38,285		3,175	38,285
Lard.....	do.....	8,000	191,800		8,000	191,800
Tallow.....	do.....	1,736	31,967		1,736	31,967
Nails.....	kegs..	7,040	33,825		7,040	33,825
Machinery.....	tons..	106	56,271	5	2,490	121
Steel rails.....	do.....	8,837	214,143		8,837	214,143
Lumber.....	M.....	569	12,821		569	12,821
Glucose.....	barrels..	100	908		100	908
Oil.....	do.....	12,775	29,893		12,775	29,893
Oil cake.....	sacks..	884	1,250		884	1,250
Unclassified.....	pkgs..	3,135	13,353		3,135	13,353
Total value.....		6,688,874		1,063,582		8,382,456

Total grain shipments by lake from Chicago and South Chicago, 1900.
[Bushels.]

Grain.	United States ports.	Depot harbor.	Goderich.	Kingston.
Barley.....	302,434	16,502		
Corn.....	67,274,511	6,531,632	183,843	2,032,589
Flaxseed.....	1,773,061	143,932		
Oats.....	20,302,689	991,119		54,812
Rye.....	249,317	180,485		21,304
Wheat.....	21,053,112	3,170,232	419,000	526,516
Total.....	111,135,124	11,033,902	603,443	2,635,221

Grain.	Midland.	Owen Sound.	Prescott.	Sarnia.	Total.
Barley.....			43,600		43,600
Corn.....	2,144,972	78,144	210,610	40,900	2,474,626
Flaxseed.....					
Oats.....	227,285			2,501,536	2,728,821
Rye.....					
Wheat.....	1,874,900		152,934		2,027,834
Total.....	4,247,157	78,144	407,144	2,541,536	7,273,981

River and Harbor Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. D. E. FINLEY,

OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, January 14, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. FINLEY said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It has long been the settled policy of this Government, that under the "general-welfare" clause of the Constitution, that it is the duty of Congress to make appropriations for the improvement of our harbors and navigable rivers. It has been stated by a distinguished gentleman in the debate on this bill that "where commerce is, where harbors are, where the great commerce-bearing rivers flow, there the money must be spent on improvements." In a general way I indorse this statement, with the qualification that wherever the conditions are such that improvements may be made and corresponding benefits derived for commerce, the work of improvement should be commenced.

Many of the most capacious harbors and greatest commerce-bearing rivers in the United States have been made such by expenditures for the purpose of improvement by the National Government. Many rivers and harbors in the United States can be cited as instances of this. Therefore it will not do to say that a river which is capable of improvement or which in times past has been navigable, such as the Great Pedee, and for various reasons, as the accumulation of rafts and snags in the bed of the river, has become unnavigable, that improvement is unnecessary because there is no annual commerce on the river.

The true test is as I have stated. Further than this, I will say that it is not necessary that all of the commerce along a river should be transported on the same when the improvement is made. In this enlightened age of progress and development commerce and transportation for healthy growth and prosperous development are inseparably connected in every line of business.

Freight rates such as will enable the business man, whether he be a merchant, manufacturer, or farmer, to compete in the matter of transportation with all others like situated as himself is most necessary.

It is a fact that railroad freights are as a rule arbitrary when uninfluenced by competition or Government supervision, and when once established remain fixed until interfered with by some outside influence.

The present river and harbor bill carries a large amount of money for the improvement of rivers and harbors. Whether too much or too little I have not the time to argue. But I will state that in my judgment it should be the settled policy of this Government to improve, when necessary for the purposes of commerce, every navigable river in the United States, for the reason that water transportation invariably brings about a reduction in freight rates on the part of the railroads ranging anywhere from 5 per cent upward. A freight steamer tied up at a wharf at any competing point is an assurance that freight rates will be properly adjusted.

The plan of improvement presented in House Doc. No. 124 contemplates improving the upper part of the Great Pedee River in South Carolina, between the Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta Railroad bridge and the town of Cheraw, the head of navigation, so as to obtain a 3½-foot channel depth at low water between the two points, at an estimated cost of \$118,345.37, and thereby open up water transportation to the Atlantic Ocean.

The commercial importance of this river is very great, as is shown by the reports of Mr. Reid Whitford, assistant engineer, and the report of the committee on commerce and navigation of the town of Cheraw, S. C., including the letter of W. C. Coker & Son and other business men of Society Hill, S. C., which I will incorporate in my remarks.

The survey has been made, and the improvement asked for is recommended by the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, and is reasonable.

Large appropriations have been made for Winyah Bay and Georgetown Harbor, into which the Great Pedee flows, and also that part of the Great Pedee up to the Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta Railroad bridge. The improvement provided for in the amendment offered will add greatly to the value of these improvements. Georgetown Harbor has been and is being improved, as it should be. That part of the Great Pedee River between Georgetown and the Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta Railroad bridge, 103 miles, has been improved.

But from this point to the town of Cheraw, some 69 miles, remains yet to be improved. The bill now under consideration carries an appropriation of \$12,000 to be expended on this work in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 124, a sum but little in excess of 10 per cent of the estimates and entirely insufficient to carry the work to speedy and successful completion.

This part of the river is more important from a commercial standpoint than the part which has already been improved. The present commerce and future probabilities are greater.

The good results that will follow the opening of the Great Pedee River from the head of navigation to the sea can not be accurately estimated. It can be said, however, that it will result in a large industrial development of the resources of Chesterfield County, in South Carolina, and a considerable area of contiguous territory.

In the issue of the Cheraw Chronicle, a newspaper published at Cheraw, S. C., of the date of January 10, 1901, there appears the following:

A large cotton-manufacturing concern with more than a million dollars surplus, which they propose to put into a mammoth cotton mill at some favorable point, and who had been prospecting in Georgia and Alabama, have, on the recommendation of their president, decided to wait and see if Cheraw is going to secure a navigable waterway to the ocean before deciding on a location.

This only illustrates that the persistency on the part of a manufacturer to locate only where he is reasonably assured of competitive freight rates is the rule almost invariably followed. And I may add that the action of the United States Congress in assuring to Columbia, S. C., water transportation by the river and harbor bill of 1899 has already resulted in great good to that town. Without this assurance I am satisfied that Columbia could not to-day occupy the place that it does in industrial matters.

Mr. Chairman, I may add that in all the time that has elapsed since the formation of this Government no money has been expended by the United States for the improvement of this part of the river. For thirty-one years following 1784 the State of South Carolina improved the Great Pedee River; and it was not until 1879 that the United States Government made a survey looking to improvement. This was not because the river was small or the commerce insignificant. The Great Pedee is one of the largest and most important rivers in the State, and the present and future commerce is inviting.

There is no lack of freight along the 69 miles of this river that is recommended to be improved in the survey embraced in House Report No. 124. There is more commerce on this part of the Pedee River than there is from the Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta Railroad bridge to the Atlantic Ocean. All the surveys made heretofore have contemplated improving this river to the head of navigation; that is, the town of Cheraw. But the fact is, all the appropriations heretofore made, amounting to \$111,500, for the improvement of this river have been expended, and I submit unfairly expended, on the part below the Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta Railroad bridge.

The amendment is in accordance with a survey made under authority of a law enacted at the last session of Congress. It contemplates only giving to these people along the upper part of the river the rights and privileges and benefits which they have been denied for more than a century. It is recommended by the Chief Engineer and the division and local engineers. The immediate commerce along the part of the river which is sought to be improved now, and which has been discriminated against so long, amounts to more than \$7,000,000 annually, or 400,000 tons. Not

only this, but within the area which will be affected in the matter of freight rates by the improvement of this part of the Pedee River there is more than two thousand million feet of lumber, possibly a greater amount than there is in any other section of the country east of the Savannah River of equal area.

So I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if it be contemplated to speculate and see what the prospective commerce of this section is, taking no account of the present, there is enough there to warrant the Congress of the United States in giving the amount which I have suggested in the amendment. I only ask that justice be done. For a hundred years it has not been done, and now is a good time to begin. [Applause.]

REPORT OF MR. REID WHITFORD, ASSISTANT ENGINEER.

UNITED STATES ENGINEER OFFICE,
Georgetown, S. C., September 8, 1900.

CAPTAIN: I have the honor to make the following report on preliminary examination of Great Pedee River, South Carolina, from Cheraw to the Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta Railroad bridge, to comply with section 2 of the emergency river and harbor act of June 6, 1900, and also in response to your letter of August 22, 1900.

DESCRIPTION AND REMARKS.

The distance between the places mentioned is approximately 60 miles. The river has considerable width and is a bold stream, carrying large quantities of water during the freshest period, but at its dead low stage the channel depth is reduced from 1 to 2 feet on probably 12 shoal places, to a great extent formed by the accumulation of sand around sunken logs and snags. Generally the water is comparatively deep both above and below the shoals. The country through which the river finds its way is considered the most productive in the State of South Carolina for cotton, corn, etc., large quantities of the above articles being harvested yearly.

The town of Cheraw, situated at the head of navigation, is a place of considerable commercial importance, of about 1,500 people. Society Hill, 17 miles farther down, located 2 to 3 miles from the river, is also a town of considerable trade, with a population of 800 to 1,000.

The country was looked over generally as to its commercial resources, and a great many people living within reach of the river express themselves as being extremely anxious for the improvement of the stream, to be finally developed into something beneficial to the industries of their country.

The Pedee people are generally alive to the importance of using their river for the economical transportation of products and supplies. They also realize the utter hopelessness of maintaining anything like a steady yearly traffic on the stream in its present condition. The country, therefore, is left at the mercy of railroad rates for the transportation rates.

HISTORY.

To say that this stream is worthy of improvement would be nothing more than the opinion expressed as far back as the year 1784, when an act of the South Carolina legislature appropriated \$200, to be expended in the removal of all obstructions as far up as the North Carolina line; 1785, an act of the same legislature to improve the river from Yauhannah Ferry, 28 miles above Georgetown, to the North Carolina line, funds for this purpose to be collected by levying a special tax upon the lands lying along the river; 1791, an act to improve the river between points mentioned in 1785 by requiring the male inhabitants of the adjacent counties to work, each, six days in the year at removing obstructions; 1805, an act of this year appropriated \$4,000 for the improvement of the river from Brittons Ferry to the North Carolina line; 1815, an act of this year was passed, which provided for the improvement from the North Carolina line down to Singleton's plantation by the 6 days' plan. All the above embraces the section of the river now ordered for preliminary examination.

It appears that in the year 1873 the United States Government assumed control of the engineering operations on this river, and it was then examined by Gen. Q. A. Gillmore, Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

Further on, in 1879, an act of Congress, March 3, provided for a survey of the river below Cheraw. This was executed under the direction of Capt. Charles B. Phillips, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in October of that year. Upon this survey was based the beginning of the regular project for the improvement of the Great Pedee River from Cheraw to its mouth, at Georgetown, a distance of approximately 172 miles. Captain Phillips recommended that the sum of \$25,530 be expended for this purpose. The survey upon which this estimate was made was very hurried, the water being high, rendering it altogether impossible to furnish an accurate estimate as to cost.

Therefore Capt. (now Maj.) William H. Bixby, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in taking charge of the work, revised the estimate, after having made a more careful examination of the river in 1885, and recommended that the total sum of \$90,000 be expended in clearing the stream of obstructions, it being understood that the section from the Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta Railroad bridge to Cheraw was to receive its proportionate part of money and work. Captain Phillips's original project of the year 1879-80, and as continued to date, provided for a thorough cleared length of navigation to Smiths Mills, 54 miles above Georgetown, to 9 feet depth, thence 3½ feet navigation to Cheraw, the head of navigation, at all stages of water.

The project contemplated that this depth would probably be acquired by the expenditure of the amount as above mentioned, but as appropriated, in small sums and at intervals of one and two years, it has been barely sufficient to keep the river channel open to navigation, by the removal of logs and fallen timber, from Georgetown, 108 miles, up to the Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta Railroad bridge.

No attempt has ever been made to remove any of the shoals by dredging, which will be necessary in order that a navigable channel depth of 3½ feet be secured and maintained, according to the original project.

Below the bridge there are several shoals, upon which there is said to be less than 3½ feet at dead low water.

COMMERCE AND NAVIGATION—PAST, PRESENT, AND PROSPECTIVE.

The river above the Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta Railroad bridge seemed to have shoaled in the past few years, or else the water supply is not now what it formerly was, as the steamers apparently are unable to make as frequent trips to Cheraw as they did in former years. I am told by Capt. F. B. Cushman, who has commanded and successfully operated steamers on the river for a good many years, that, from his own personal knowledge, the commerce in past years was very much greater than it is now, and the steamers found much less difficulty in running on the river, and their trips could be much more surely counted on in getting to Cheraw; but, owing to the probable raising of the shoals and the accumulation of other obstructions, that year by year the boats have been forced to greater irregularity in their trips, until now the commerce is, by comparison, very little or nothing.

It has been stated in a general way, as a matter of interest, in setting forth the value of the Great Pedee River as a highway of commerce, that there has been known to have been shipped many years ago as much as 50,000 bales of cotton from landings between Cheraw and the Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta Railroad bridge annually.

From the best information attainable there is at this time practically no fixed yearly commerce on the river, except such as is carried on by timber rafts, of which no approximate account could be secured.

The prospective commerce is enough to attract favorable attention toward this stream, as will be seen in the attached statement from the people at Cheraw, Society Hill, and landings along the river, which, being reduced to figures, amounts to, in aggregate, 355,425 tons, valued at \$7,022,500, could the river be navigated continuously at all stages of the water.

The Great Pedee River is known to be one of the most valuable for commerce and trade in the State, and therefore, taking all the foregoing into consideration, is deemed well worthy of continued improvement by the General Government, and it is recommended that a detailed survey of it be made with the view of revising and enlarging the original estimate for its improvement between Cheraw and the Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta Railroad bridge to 3½ feet depth at dead low water. Such a survey would probably cost \$1,300, including the general map of the river, as well as an extra detailed survey of each shoal, from which to make estimates for dredging, transportation of surveying party, etc.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

REID WHITFORD,
Assistant Engineer.

Capt. J. C. SANFORD,
Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

LETTER OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND NAVIGATION OF THE BUSINESS LEAGUE OF CHERAW, S. C.

CHERAW, S. C., August 23, 1900.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with your request, we, the undersigned committee on commerce and navigation of the business league of the town of Cheraw, hereby submit to you the following report of the probable commerce of the said town of Cheraw, which would result on account of the opening of the Great Pedee River for navigation from the Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta Railroad bridge across the said river to the town of Cheraw:

75,000 tons fertilizer.....	\$1,575.00
Naval stores.....	24.00
Merchandise.....	1,000.00
500,000 sticks of timber.....	1,444.00
40,000 bales of cotton.....	1,800.00
Probable total.....	6,819.00

The town of Cheraw is situated in the northeastern portion of the State of South Carolina, at the head of navigation of the Great Pedee River, and at the intersection of the Seaboard Air Line and the Atlantic Coast Line railroads. It is a progressive town and needs only proper freight rates to make it one of the best commercial and distributing points in the two Carolinas, but on account of the fact that the Great Pedee River is not open to navigation the town is at the mercy of the two great railroad companies, which now afford the only means by which business with the outside world can be carried on, and in many instances the high freight rates now in force make it almost impossible to carry on commerce with the outside world to advantage. We not only, under our present condition, can not undersell other points, but in many instances can not even compete with them.

With the rates to which we should be entitled on account of our geographical position, being the only town within 80 miles which could under any circumstances have water navigation, we should have such freight rates that no town could compete with us. Instead of remaining a town of 1,500 inhabitants, and so remaining forever, we should in a very short time, with deep water in the Pedee, become a city of 25,000 inhabitants. Situated in the very heart of the cotton-growing region, with the best class of labor, and with fuel plentiful, with good water and a mild and healthful climate, there is no reason except the high freight rates why Cheraw should not become one of the greatest cotton-manufacturing centers in the South.

The Seaboard Air Line Railroad has just been completed from Cheraw to Columbia, S. C., and there is now another road under construction from this point to Lancaster, S. C., and these two new roads will no doubt do much toward the development of the town, but that is not all Cheraw needs. The freight rates will not be much, if any, reduced on account of the railroad competition. What we need is water rates to compel all these roads to reduce rates.

As an instance of the high rates now in force, we cite the rates following on cotton:

Freight per hundredweight from Cheraw to New York on cotton.....	\$0.59
Freight per hundredweight from Cheraw to Liverpool on cotton.....	.75

From this it will be seen that the rate on cotton from Cheraw, S. C., to Liverpool, England, is only 16 cents per hundredweight higher than it is to the city of New York.

Therefore we, the said committee, hereby respectfully request that a survey of the said section of the Great Pedee River be made as early as possible and that an estimate be made for the deepening of the channel of the same, so as to afford a channel with a draft of at least 3½ feet at any and all times, so that the said report may be submitted at the next session of Congress.

C. A. MALLOY,
T. C. D. MALLOY,
H. W. FINLAYSON,
W. P. POLLOCK,
W. F. STEVENSON,
H. P. DUVAL.

Committee on Commerce and Navigation of the
Business League of the Town of Cheraw, S. C.

Mr. REID WHITFORD,
United States Assistant Engineer, Georgetown, S. C.

SOCIETY HILL, S. C., August 23, 1900.

DEAR SIR: Our village is on the Great Pedee River. We have only one railroad by our town and have to submit to any rate of freight they may charge us. We think if the Pedee was made navigable for steamers the year through it would be a great advantage to us in securing reasonable freight rates.

In answer to your inquiry as to the amount of freights handled at this point will say:

4,000 bales of cotton.....	\$200.00
650 carloads brick.....	35.00
50 carloads timber.....	4.00
400 carloads wood, at \$40.....	16.00
8,000 tons of merchandise.....	800.00

We are glad to know that Congress is about to take some steps toward making our rivers navigable. We are in the midst of the most fertile part of the State of South Carolina, with fine climate and good water. There are landings above and below us that receive and ship large quantities of freight by steamer when the river is navigable.

We are satisfied that a competing carrier would get a good per cent of the above business.

W. C. COKER & SON.
E. T. BARENTINE, M. D.
Z. W. WINES, P. M.
D. L. WINTERS.
A. M. SOMPAYRAC.
L. E. CARRIGAN.
JNO. E. SUMNER.

Mr. REID WHITFORD,
Assistant United States Engineer, Georgetown, S. C.

Other landings on the river (collected by Mr. William H. Johnstone during the survey):

Outward freights:	
20,000 bales of cotton, 5,000 tons, valued at.....	\$1,000,000
10,000 tons cotton seed, at \$15, valued at.....	150,000
	1,150,000
Inward freights:	
10,000 tons fertilizers, at \$18.....	180,000
12,000 tons general merchandise, at \$60.....	720,000
Total.....	2,050,000

No estimate could be formed of the amount of naval stores, timber, shingles, cross-ties, corn, and other products which would probably pass over the river from these intermediate landings. They would evidently amount to no little each year.

For full history of the efforts in the past made to improve the Great Pedee River see report on examination of this stream September 8, 1900.

Mr. William H. Johnstone, surveyor, rendered valuable service in completing the survey thoroughly, and in a most satisfactory manner, in a short time.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,
REID WHITFORD, Assistant Engineer.

Capt. J. C. SANFORD,
Corps of Engineers, U. S. A.

Army Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES DICK,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, December 6, 1900,

On the bill (S. 4300) to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States.

Mr. DICK said:

Mr. SPEAKER: There should be no delay in the passage of the bill now under consideration, "to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States." Every consideration urges prompt action. There is no doubt as to the policy of the Administration in respect to the Philippine Islands or any of our new possessions. They have come to us as the result of war, their accession has been sanctioned by treaty, and it is the declared policy of the Administration, indorsed as it has been by the people of the country at the polls, to give to the Filipinos stable government, republican in form, as soon as they shall be capable of administering it. That the result of our late war with Spain has made an increase in the Army necessary is apparent. The situation in the Philippines demands a force equal to that now in the archipelago.

The Secretary of War informs us that speedy action is necessary and gives his reasons for it in his report from which I quote:

Under the existing provisions of the act of March 2, 1890, on the 30th of June next the present volunteer force will be discharged and the Regular Army will be reduced to 2,447 officers and 29,025 enlisted men, distributed as follows:

	Officers.	Enlisted men.
General officers.....	9	
Adjutant-General's Department.....	17	
Inspector-General's Department.....	10	
Judge-Advocate-General's Department.....	8	
Quartermaster-General's Department.....	57	80
Subsistence Department.....	22	90
Medical Department.....	122	
Paymaster's Department.....	23	
Corps of Engineers.....	127	500
Ordnance Department.....	67	805
Signal Corps.....	11	50
Record and Pension Office.....	2	
Chaplains.....	34	
Ten regiments of cavalry.....	480	6,170
Seven regiments of artillery.....	385	8,050
Twenty-five regiments of infantry.....	1,050	13,125
Miscellaneous.....		355
Total.....	2,447	29,025

This force is about one-third as great in proportion to the population of the country as it was thirty years ago. As our country has grown in wealth and variety of interests, and as more intimate contact with the other nations of the earth has resulted from the natural extension of our trade, there has been an increase in the duties required from the regular establishment fully equal to our increase in population. (Report of the Secretary of War, 1900.)

That this deficiency should be provided for before the actual reduction takes place I am sure no member of this House will seriously dispute. On the 30th day of June, less than six months from this date, the term of service of 35,000 volunteers and about 5,000 regulars will expire. To withdraw this force from the front without filling their places would be to surrender to the insurgents a large territory and abandon to lawless bands of savage and semi-savage marauders and bandits peaceable and law-abiding Filipinos who have accepted in good faith the sovereignty of the United States. And yet the Government must either break faith with the thousands of our citizens now in the Philippines, who in a spirit of patriotism have voluntarily offered their lives as a sacrifice in defense of our country's rights and her honor, or it must furl the Stars and Stripes and retreat.

Thousands of our citizens are now in the Philippines who, at the call of their country, have enlisted in the Army with the distinct understanding that they should be relieved promptly at the end of their terms of service. Good faith demands that the contract be faithfully carried out. It is hard to believe that anyone for any cause would trifle with not only their rights, but their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to no one, on this floor or elsewhere, in my admiration for and confidence in the volunteer soldiery of this country. The battles of our country have been fought and our victories won by the volunteer soldier, and, I might add, by the "rank and file," from Lexington and Concord to San Juan Hill; from the very inception of our Government to the present time. But I do not forget that the regular is also a volunteer. I am glad to say that we have no conscripts in our Army. In a large majority of cases the regular soldier was born under the Stars and Stripes, reared under the same influences, and educated in the same school, side by side with his comrade of the Volunteer Army; and when their respective terms of service shall expire they will return home together and engage in the arts of peace. They are alike entitled to the care and protection of the Government.

That there has been almost criminal sacrifice of life in all our wars by rushing into battle undisciplined, untrained troops, is painfully true. I agree with my colleague from Illinois, that—

An Army officer has the lives of his men in hand, and the complaint about mismanagement at our camps during the late Spanish war was not due to the quality of our men, but was largely due to a lack of proper knowledge and technical training on the part of some of the officers.

My colleague's views are in line with those of all our great statesmen and generals who have spoken on this subject. As early as September 24, 1776, General Washington in a letter to the President of Congress, urging the importance of a regular army, said:

To place any dependence upon militia is assuredly resting upon a broken staff. Men just dragged from the tender scenes of domestic life, unaccustomed to the din of arms, totally unacquainted with any kind of military skill (which is followed by want of confidence in themselves when opposed to troops regularly trained, disciplined, and appointed, superior in knowledge and superior in arms), are timid and ready to fly from their own shadows. Besides the sudden change in their manner of living, particularly in their manner of lodging, brings on sickness in many, impatience in all, and such an unconquerable desire of returning to their respective homes that it not only produces shameful and scandalous desertions among themselves, but infuses the like spirit in others.

And again, September 15, 1780, in a letter to the President of Congress, he made the following statement:

Regular troops alone are equal to the exigencies of modern war, as well as for defense or offense, and whenever a substitute is attempted it must prove illusory and ruinous. * * * The firmness requisite for the real business of fighting is only to be attained by a constant course of discipline and service. I have never been witness to a single instance that can justify a different opinion, and it is most earnestly to be wished that the liberties of America may no longer be trusted in any material degree to so precarious a dependence.

Col. Nelson A. Miles, Fifth Infantry, major-general in the volunteer service, now Lieutenant-General Commanding the Army, testified before the military commission in 1876 as follows:

In organization and administration it is indispensable that the first place be given to the system and method that will make the Army most efficient as a body of fighting men; that the essential functions of supply, equipment, and administration, that require the commercial virtues, honesty and industry, but not great military capacity, should take their proper place as subordinate members, not usurp those of the directing head of the body, the Army; that the ability to organize, care for, discipline, command, and fight troops be sought for, cultivated, and rewarded.

Before the same commission Col. Augustus V. Kautz, Eighth Infantry, commanding Department of Arizona, brigadier-general of volunteers and brevet major-general, testified as follows:

With all that the late war has cost the country in life and property, it has taught us nothing for the future, and the nation is as destitute of military system to-day as when that war began. Should such a disaster come upon us again to-morrow, I would expect to see again the distressing spectacle of the youth of the land called out for sixty or ninety days and returning at the end of that time with ranks depleted and constitutions broken, not by the foe, but simply because there was not a soldier of experience in the regiment to tell them how to take care of themselves.

So the judgment and testimony of our most distinguished military men are against the employment of raw troops—militia, if you please—in times of war; and the only way to avoid it is to create a regular establishment sufficiently large to meet any emergency that may arise. Experience teaches us that our military establishment always has been deficient in this respect. At no time when war has been forced on the Government has it had a sufficient regular force to meet the emergency. This is precisely what we are trying to remedy, and it can not be done too quickly. It amounts to almost a crime to rush raw troops into battle under inexperienced officers, and I say this without reflection on the intelligence, patriotism, or valor of either the men or officers. These are qualities that are unquestioned in the American people—a fact which has been demonstrated on many a bloody field.

General Schofield once said:

Valor is the most common thing in the United States. There are at least 2,000,000 men you could bring in at any time whose valor would be unsurpassed. I do not say it is the cheapest thing. I would not say that, but it is the commonest thing among the American people.

There is no doubt about the accuracy of that statement, and no one is more competent to speak on that subject than is General Schofield; but valor alone will not prevail against the present destructive weapons of war. The time was when the wage of battle depended upon valor, physical strength, and endurance, but as the weapons of war grow more and more destructive, valor must be blended with other qualities to be effective. So it becomes necessary that both officers and enlisted men be thoroughly schooled in the art of war, at least as far as it relates to their respective grades. It is not enough that the soldier should know how to shoot and take care of himself in battle; he should know how to take care of himself in the camp and on the march, which knowledge can be gained only by long experience, or from officers who have acquired a knowledge of the military service by training in school, or by long experience in the camp and field.

In order that our Army may continue to command the respect and confidence of our people at home and the admiration of the nations of the world it should attain the highest standard of effectiveness and of discipline. Every soldier should undergo thorough individual training; and the officer, even in subordinate rank, having in charge the education, the discipline, and the care of men should be educated and trained in the moral as well as the physical faculties, in order that he may inspire the confidence of those under his care. He should be able to teach the science as well as the art of war. This is all the more necessary because of the recent great improvements in firearms, their great intricacy of construction, and the consequent change in tactics as well as in the methods of fighting.

It is within the memory of men still living when the old flint-lock was the standard arm; and the development from that primitive contrivance in use in our Revolutionary and other early wars to our present intricate and rapid-firing rifle was not rapid. Indeed, the development of military science and the evolution of the art of war from ancient times to within the last thirty years—about the close of our civil war—was exceedingly slow and gradual, and therefore it was not difficult to keep abreast of progress, and the necessity for legislation on the subject was not so pressing; but the time has come when our military establishment must be adjusted to the advanced conditions.

It is gratifying that the morale of our Army has been raised to a high standard, for no system of tactics nor the skill and intrepidity of any leader can guarantee victory when the morale of an army is bad. Our Regular Army is not an asylum for criminals or other unworthy citizens; it is not made up of conscripts, but of men who through patriotism and a military spirit, desiring the experience and education it affords them, voluntarily enter it, therefore maintaining for it a high standard.

On this subject Gen. Wesley Merritt says:

A term of service judiciously spent in the Army is an advantage to a young man second only to a university course. It improves him physically, broadens his mental view, and fits him to compete in life with the educated and enterprising. Some of the most successful men in the Western country are among those who have served a term in the Army. They are proud of their service and grateful for the advantages it has brought them. No young man not having superior advantages need now hesitate to adopt the Army as an experience which will increase his opportunities for success in any profession.

In line with this Gen. Nelson A. Miles says:

The science of war has become a fixed science, and the appliances of war are different from what they used to be in olden times when our fathers used to take their hunting rifles and make the best fighting men on the continent, for now we have the use of smokeless powder, high-power guns, magazine guns, low trajectory, long-range rifles, machine guns, dynamite, and all of those appliances which were unknown thirty years ago and were not in use during the great civil war.

The Secretary of War, in his recent annual report, speaking of our improved defensive machinery, ascribes the very highest necessity for special training of both officers and men. He says:

No one can use this defensive machinery or take proper care of it and keep it in order without being instructed and trained in its uses. For this purpose it is necessary to have an adequate force of artillery officers and men who make the handling of such machinery their business. This is prac-

tically a new requirement for the Army. It did not exist to any considerable extent prior to the building of the new fortifications. The number of men necessary to perform this duty is capable of exact computation, and the number required according to the men most familiar with the business is, at a minimum allowance, 18,420.

On this subject the remarks of Gen. Winfield S. Hancock are also pertinent. He says:

I believe, and I presume you know as well as I do (although it is a matter requiring too much time to be gone into fully here), that one of our greatest deficiencies in time of war is the want of a general staff of the Army, as it is called in continental Europe. The officers are selected from all the branches of the service—engineers, artillery, infantry, and cavalry—tried and talented young men. They are then sent to a school for, I believe, two years, where they learn the matters of administration, etc., so far as it can be taught to them theoretically and practically in that time. They are then sent to serve in each arm of the service, for probably two years, except their own, to familiarize them with the tactics and the practical operation of each arm of the service. This plan forms a large body of men of general information—accomplished men. From that body are taken the chiefs of staffs of armies, corps, divisions, and sometimes brigades, and also the adjutant-generals of the different commands. Also from that body are taken the aids, and it is quite a useful school for the education of general officers, too. The tendency of the system is, of course, to make of these officers men who know more about the details of all the branches of the service than any other officers, because they serve with all arms of the service. This in our country would be especially important, as we raise large armies from the people.

While the opposition are proclaiming their love and affection for the "old volunteer," they are by one flimsy pretext or another doing precisely what the old volunteer does not want done. What the old volunteer wants, and what in justice should be done, is to return him to his home when he shall have fulfilled his part of the contract.

The opposition objects to our providing a standing army in time of peace as if that were a new phase of the question. They object to the sliding scale, as they term it, as if that were something new in Army legislation. They are perfectly willing to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States by reducing it.

Mr. Speaker, I am as much opposed to a standing army disproportionate to our population as any gentleman on the other side. But I believe we should have a force sufficient to meet any sudden emergency, and this belief is verified by experience as well as by the best judgment of the wisest.

In arguing for the maintenance of a standing army, when the adoption of the Constitution was under consideration, James Madison said:

If one nation maintains constantly a disciplined army, ready for the service of ambition or revenge, it obliges the most pacific nation which may be within the reach of its enterprises to take corresponding precautions.

What would be an adequate corresponding precaution at this time is a question for the judgment of this House. In every civilized country a certain proportion of the population is dedicated to the military service. At present Germany has 11½ soldiers to every 1,000 of her population; France has 14; England, 5½; Austro-Hungary, Russia, Turkey, and Italy each have 7; while the United States has less than 1 soldier to every 1,000 population, a number utterly insignificant as compared with the armies of other nations. Our interest as well as our area has expanded, and I believe, under these conditions, that an Army as provided for in the bill now before Congress is not too large as a permanent establishment.

In this connection I desire to call the attention of the gentlemen on the other side to what the "Father of his Country" thought the strength of a standing army, for safety, should be, even when the population of the country did not reach 3,000,000 people.

In his letter of September 24, 1776, to which I have just referred, General Washington in part said:

Certain I am that it would be cheaper to keep fifty or a hundred thousand in constant pay than to depend upon half the number and supply the other half occasionally by militia. * * * The jealousy of a standing army and the evils to be apprehended from one are remote and, in my judgment, situated and circumstanced as we are, not at all to be dreaded; but the consequence of wanting one, according to my ideas formed from the present view of things, is certain and inevitable ruin. For, if I was called upon to declare under oath whether the militia have been most serviceable or hurtful upon the whole, I should subscribe to the latter. I do not mean by this, however, to arraign the conduct of Congress; in so doing I should equally condemn my own measures if I did not my judgment; but experience, which is the best criterion to work by, so fully, clearly, decisively reprobates the practice of trusting to militia that no man who regards order, regularity, and economy, or who has any regard for his own honor, character, or peace of mind, will risk them upon this issue.

Again, December 5, 1776, he wrote:

* * * My first wish is that Congress may be convinced * * * of the necessity of raising a larger standing army than they have voted. The savings in the articles of stores, provisions, and in a thousand other things by having nothing to do with militia, unless in cases of extraordinary exigency, and such as could not be expected in the common course of events, would amply support a large army, which, well officered, would be daily improving instead of continuing a destructive, expensive, and disorderly mob. I am clear in the opinion that if 40,000 men had been kept in constant pay since the first commencement of hostilities, and the militia had been excused from doing duty during that period, the country would have saved money. When I reflect on the losses we have sustained for want of good troops, the certainty of this is placed beyond a doubt in my mind.

And again, in his letter to the President of Congress, dated "Headquarters near Passaic Falls, N. J.," October 11, 1780, he

urged an establishment the maximum of which should be 30,000 and a minimum of 20,000, in the following language:

It is not easy to be conceived except by those who are witness to an additional waste and consumption of everything, and consequently what an increase of expense, result from laxity of discipline in the Army; and where the officers think they are doing the public a favor by holding their commissions, and the men are continually fluctuating, it is impossible to maintain discipline. Nothing can be more obvious than that a sound military establishment and the interests of economy are the same. * * * Twenty-two thousand fighting men appear to be necessary on a defensive plan. To have these our total number must be 30,000, rank and file. The wagoners, workmen at factories, waiters, men for other extra service, and sick, on an average, make at least a fourth of the total number, which Congress may see by recurring to the returns of the Army from time to time.

Writing on this subject in the North American Review, an extract from which was submitted by Gen. W. T. Sherman to the joint committee of which Senator Burnside was chairman, General Garfield said:

It is a significant fact that, while numberless petitions and remonstrances upon almost all subjects of legislation have been constantly pouring into Congress, yet during the last eight years not one petition has been addressed to either the Senate or the House praying for the decrease of our military establishment. Our people remember with gratitude the great captains who in the late war led their soldiers to victory to save the Republic from overthrow. They thoroughly learned the lesson that in times of extreme peril the preservation of liberty and peace depends upon the disciplined valor of the nation, and that the science and art of war can be acquired only by the thorough and patient study and practice of its elements. This work they expect of the Army, and the annual amount which they cheerfully pay for its support is the cost of national insurance against foes from without and anarchy within. * * *

The Army should be large enough to preserve inviolate our national boundaries and protect our widely extended frontier settlements against Indian hostilities, to keep the peace and protect the public property in all places subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, and to aid the several States in case of invasion or insurrection too powerful to be controlled by their local authorities. * * * In determining how large an army is needed we must consider the extent of territory for the defense of which it was created. * * *

A republic, however free, requires the service of a certain number of men whose ambition is higher than mere private gains, whose lives are inseparable from the life of the nation, and whose labors and emoluments depend absolutely upon the honor and prosperity of the government, and who can advance themselves only by serving their country.

So it appears that our wise and patriotic statesmen and generals from the inception of our Government to the present have urged a standing army much larger in proportion to the population than we have heretofore had or than we have now, and events have shown the wisdom of their judgment. General Washington urged a permanent military establishment more than six and at one time even ten times greater in proportion to the population at that time than that which the present bill provides. The average number of soldiers to 1,000 of population from 1790 to 1860 was 24. With the exception of two or three decade periods this is less than the average. From 1850 to 1860 the Army—through unfriendly legislation and otherwise—was reduced to the rate of one-fourth of a soldier to 1,000 population. In that time a most gigantic conspiracy against the life of the nation was consummated.

The men who managed that conspiracy, fearing the loyalty of the Regular Army, were careful not to strike the blow until the Army was reduced to mere handfuls of men, less than one soldier to every 4,000 population. Having distributed these so that they could not be made immediately effective and having dispersed our Navy to distant parts of the world, when the Government had no national force available to protect itself, they struck the blow, and the country was plunged into a wicked, brutal, expensive, and bloody war; wicked, because it struck at the life of the best Government on earth and aimed to perpetuate human slavery—the blight of the nineteenth century; brutal, because it arrayed brother against brother, brave men against brave men, men who were equal in valor and loyalty to their respective causes—equal in everything except the righteousness of their cause. Perhaps no braver men ever lived than the men who wore the gray. The rank and file were loyal to the Constitution and to its flag, as I verily believe; but reared in a school of politics which taught them that their first duty was to the State, and firmly believing in that doctrine, they followed their leaders into that great conspiracy. That they at heart loved our form of government, the Constitution, and the flag was demonstrated by the alacrity with which they went to the support of the Stars and Stripes in our late war with Spain. That the civil war was an expensive and bloody one our immense war debt and large pension roll attests.

The necessity for and value of a standing army is shown in the New York riots of 1864 and the railroad riots in 1877 and 1894. It is a part of the history of those riots that the mobs yielded peacefully to the regular troops when they appeared.

The contention that the regular establishment of the Government in all our wars has been inadequate when the emergency came upon us is sustained by comments of our military experts. It was true in the war of the Revolution, the war of 1812, the Mexican war, the Florida war, and others; and especially in the case of our civil war, of which Maj. Samuel Breck, Assistant Adjutant-General, brevet brigadier-general, U. S. A., and afterwards Adjutant-General of the Army, says:

Had the Army been large enough so that President Lincoln could have put 35,000 or 40,000 regulars at once in the field I believe the incipient war would have ended promptly and properly and money been saved sufficient to pay the expenses of an army of 50,000 men three hundred years, not to speak of the lives of those who perished.

Those who look forward to an unending period of peace may think with profit how few of the North in 1860 anticipated any war at all, and even when the first call for men was made the war was expected to be a small affair of sixty or ninety days. The last twenty-five years have given rise to the war in the Crimea, the war in Italy, the war between Prussia and Austria, the war in France, in addition to our own, and the wars with and among half-civilized peoples. Does this past promise a long future of peace? Few nations of the earth have been exempt from war in this period of twenty-five years, and the art of war, both on sea and land, has made progress hitherto without a parallel. Can we with safety disregard the wisdom contained in the maxim, "In time of peace prepare for war?"

The staff corps of the Army ought to be not merely for the present necessities of the Army, but also for the purpose of having an educated and trained body of experts to assist in raising an army and putting it in the field when war comes. This needs only to be thought of to be an acknowledged necessity.

This absurd opposition to a standing army and its establishment in time of peace has made its appearance in some kind of disguise at every stage of our progress since union was first attempted in this country. It rendered impotent the Union under the Articles of Confederation. It made its appearance when the question of the adoption of the Constitution was pending, and since that time, in every instance when the subject of Army legislation has come before Congress, the Regular Army has been held up as a menace to constitutional liberty in language intended to mislead and inflame the people and to engender and intensify class prejudice.

In urging that absolute power be vested in Congress in respect to a regular army in time of peace, Alexander Hamilton said, and his argument has been adopted by Judge Story in his able Commentary on the Constitution:

These powers ought to exist without limitation, because it is impossible to foresee or define the extent and varieties of national exigencies or the correspondent extent and variety of the means which may be necessary to satisfy them.

Mr. Hamilton further said:

The circumstances that endanger the safety of nations are infinite, and for this reason no constitutional shackles can wisely be imposed on the power to which the care of it is committed. This power ought to be coextensive with all the possible combinations of such circumstances, and ought to be under the direction of the same councils which are appointed to preside over the common defense.

This is one of those truths which, to a correct and unprejudiced mind, carries its own evidence along with it, and may be obscured, but can not be made plainer by argument or reasoning. It rests upon axioms as simple as they are universal. The means ought to be proportioned to the end. The persons from whose agency the attainment of any end is expected ought to possess the means by which it is to be attained.

Mr. Speaker, in a republic like ours, envied by the old forms of government all over the world, an emergency is always imminent; and the Secretary of War in his report just quoted strongly intimates an emergency at this time on account of our extension of trade. Trade extension and commercial supremacy are always a most prolific source of war, and nothing has more seriously influenced the history of the world and the welfare of nations. An eminent French economist, speaking of the mercantile system, says:

It has made each nation regard the welfare of its neighbors as incompatible with its own; and hence that spirit of commercial rivalry which has been the immediate or remote cause of the greater number of modern wars.

That the commercial supremacy of the world is rapidly passing into our hands is evident. Take exports alone. The United States in the past eleven months has surpassed the total for Great Britain by over \$5,000,000. Statistics show that in the last quarter of the nineteenth century France has made no gain in her exports of domestic merchandise. In the same period Germany shows an increase of only 50 per cent, and the United Kingdom has gained 40 per cent, while the United States, the youngest of them all, shows an increase of over 200 per cent. Of the \$18,000,000,000 total commerce of the world, the United States is credited with over 11 per cent, a greater per cent than is shown by any of the countries of the world except the United Kingdom, whose percentage includes the business done by her colonies and dependencies.

Our exports show an increase of \$166,331,178 for the ten months ending October, 1900, as compared with the corresponding ten months of 1899, and the total for the ten months in question is practically double what it was during the corresponding months of 1894. Our exports of manufactured products for the nine months ending September, 1900, amounted to \$338,678,243, as against \$327,502,649 for the corresponding months of 1899, and \$145,793,834 during the same months of 1895, thus indicating an increase of manufactured exports for one year of nearly 25 per cent, and the amount has more than doubled during the four years from 1896 to 1900, while the importation of manufacturers' materials has also increased at a very rapid rate. Our exports of iron and steel for the ten months ending with October, 1900, amounted to \$110,000,000, as against \$86,000,000 for the corresponding months of 1899 and \$51,000,000 for the corresponding months of 1897.

showing that the amount has more than doubled during the three years from 1897 to 1900.

Our exportation of agricultural products for the ten months ending October, 1900, amounted, in round terms, to \$700,000,000 as against \$625,000,000 for the same month in 1899. Exports from the United States for the ten months ending with October, 1900, show an increase, as already referred to, of \$166,000,000, yet during the same period the exports of the United Kingdom increased but \$125,000,000. During the year 1900 neither Belgium, Spain, nor Italy showed any apparent increase in exportations. Reports for the current year show that in Belgium, France, Spain, Italy, Germany, and the United Kingdom the imports exceeded the exports, while the exports from this country vastly exceeded the imports, the amount for the ten months ending with October, 1900, being \$499,667,936, or a greater excess than has been attained during the corresponding period of any preceding year and a greater excess than that attained by any other country of the world.

It is therefore unsafe to act upon the assumption that because we are now at peace with all the nations of the earth there is no danger that our relations may be disturbed and our country drawn into war in order to protect our rights. We can not tell what hour some one of the powers may see fit to interfere with our trade; and we are within the reach of the "enterprise" of a number of powerful nations who, alleging encroachment on their trade rights as a grievance, may attack our interests in such a way as to compel the use of troops, in what numbers it is impossible to predict. We have powerful governments on the north and on the south of us; and while we are at peace with them, it is not an infrequent occurrence that the best friends fall out.

Our relations with Great Britain have been greatly strained many times since the close of the civil war, and in a number of cases war was averted only by diplomacy. For instance, the *Alabama* claims case, which, though not without apprehension of war, was submitted to and amicably settled by the Geneva board of arbitration; the fisheries dispute; the Bering Sea difficulty; the Venezuela case, which at one time presented a very serious aspect, and the Alaskan boundary. Our relations from time to time within the period named have been strained with nations in other parts of the world, which made it necessary to hold in readiness troops that were needed in our garrisons and which could with difficulty be spared for other employment. Notably among these instances are the Chilean affair, the troubles in the Hawaiian Islands, and in Samoa. Gentlemen may say that these emergencies could be met by enlistment of volunteers when needed. Under the old system of fighting this may have been true, yet at a sacrifice of blood and money that has been shown to be unnecessary, and which could be avoided by an ample regular establishment. Present conditions would not admit of this. Recent wars, on account of improvement of arms and other reasons, have been of short duration.

On this subject General Merritt says:

The war between France and Austria (1859) lasted two months and that between Austria and Prussia (1866) lasted a little over a month. The Franco-Prussian war of 1870, in which the territory of France was completely overrun, their capital and central city besieged and captured, and the nation made to pay a ransom such as modern statesmen had not dreamed of, was finished in a little more than a half year. The war between Russia and Turkey, with its sieges of fortified places and severe battling at the passage of rivers and the mountain ranges, was concluded in much less time than one year. In other words, no war between the war-making powers of Europe in the last thirty years has occupied the time it would take to prepare the best reserves we have for the field.

The same may be said of more recent wars; the wars between Japan and China, Turkey and Greece, and our late war with Spain, which was concluded in the short space of one hundred days. That war alone is sufficient to demonstrate the absurdity and the wickedness of throwing into active service, in a foreign country, unacclimated, undisciplined recruits. Everyone who has given the subject thought knows that if the Government had had 50,000 or even 30,000 well-organized and well-disciplined troops available at the outbreak of the Spanish war, victory could have been accomplished in the same length of time with infinitely less loss of life and a less expenditure of money than was required under the system that our opponents are now trying to force on the country.

Again, it is impossible for us to know when a blow may be struck at our Government. The war of the rebellion came as if in a night, and the Spanish war came like a cyclone, and, increasing in volume, was upon us before it could be fully realized. On the other hand, in this age a formal declaration of war is not necessary, so that an attack may follow immediately the suspension of diplomatic relations. It will be made when our defenses are weakest, and no one doubts that every foreign nation knows almost to a certainty at all times the exact strength of our Army and of our coast defenses.

The framers of this measure have provided—

That the President is authorized to maintain the enlisted force of the several organizations of the Army at their maximum as fixed by this act during the present exigencies of the service, or until such time as Congress may hereafter direct.

That this is an abdication of the powers of Congress is too absurd for serious consideration. It is in line with precedent running through the entire history of the Republic, as has been clearly shown by my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER]. I quote from what he has said on this point, by which it will be seen that this bill guards more carefully the rights and powers of Congress than has any previous legislative acts of Congress conferring on the President authority to enlarge or decrease the Army.

May 28, 1798, in anticipation of a war with France, Congress passed an act which authorized the President—

In the event of a declaration of war against the United States, or of actual invasion of their territory by a foreign power, or of imminent danger of such invasion, discovered in his opinion to exist, before the next session of Congress, to cause to be enlisted and called into service troops not exceeding 10,000.

July 16, 1798, Congress conferred on the President power, in his discretion—

To raise, in addition to the present military establishment, 12 regiments of infantry and 6 troops of light dragoons, to be enlisted for and during the continuance of the existing differences between the United States and the French Republic, unless sooner discharged.

March, 1799, Congress conferred upon the President certain powers, and among them—

In case of danger of the invasion of their territory by any power shall, in his opinion, be discovered to exist, to organize 24 regiments of infantry, besides riflemen, artillerymen, and cavalry.

May 14, 1800, the President was given power to suspend further appointments in the military establishment.

March 16, 1802, the President was given authority, when he should deem it expedient, to organize a corps of engineers.

March 8, 1803, the President was authorized, in his discretion, and at such a time as he should deem expedient, to require the governors of such of the States as he might deem proper, and from their situation most convenient, to take necessary and effectual measures to arm and equip, in accordance with the provisions of law, and hold in readiness to march at a moment's notice, forces of militia to a number not exceeding 80,000, including officers.

January 2, 1812, Congress conferred upon the President, when he should have satisfactory evidence of an actual or threatened invasion of any State by any Indian tribes, to raise, either by the acceptance of volunteers or by enlistment for one year, as many companies as he might, in his discretion, deem necessary, not exceeding 6, as rangers.

January 20, 1813, Congress provided that such a number of regiments of infantry, not exceeding 20, should be enlisted as, in the judgment of the President, might be deemed necessary for the welfare and protection of the country.

June 15, 1832, Congress authorized the President to accept the services, by the acceptance of volunteers or by enlistments for one year, of 600 mounted rangers, as the conditions of the service, in his judgment, rendered necessary.

May 23, 1836, the President was authorized to raise volunteers—either infantry or cavalry—not to exceed 10,000 men, to serve for a period of six or twelve months.

May 13, 1846, Congress enacted—

That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized by voluntary enlistment to increase the number of privates in each and any company of the existing regiments of dragoons, artillery, and infantry, to any number not exceeding 100, whenever in his opinion the exigencies of the public service may require the same; and to reduce the same to 64 when the exigencies requiring the present increase shall cease: *Provided*, That said enlistments shall be for the term of five years and no longer, unless sooner disbanded by the President.

June 18, 1846, Congress extended the power of the President to increase or diminish the companies of volunteers already in service.

Discussing the proposed reduction of the Army in the House of Representatives, February 9, 1869, General Garfield said:

The Army as it stood before the war was admitted on all hands to be the smallest organization consistent with the public safety in time of peace. We had in 1860 an Army of 11,848 enlisted men and 1,083 commissioned officers. In July, 1866, not quite three years ago, Congress discussed very fully what should be our future Army, and, after a long debate in both Houses, passed the law of July 28, 1866, fixing the military peace establishment. That law authorized 5 regiments of artillery, 10 of cavalry, and 45 of infantry, and fixed the staff departments as they are now organized. The law so fixed the maximum and minimum strength of a regiment of each arm of the service that the Army might contain as many as 80,370 or as few as 47,270 of enlisted men. Whether it should, in fact, be larger, the larger or the smaller number, or any intermediate number was left to the wisdom and discretion of the President of the United States.

This law of July, 1866, was the last legislative utterance of the people of the United States through their Congress in regard to their peace establishment, and that utterance declared that we should have an army of about 3,300 commissioned officers, and from 47,000 to 80,000 enlisted men. The President used this discretion given him by this law, and I will show how he has used it. The new Army organized in accordance with this law amounted in 1867 to 54,641 men. One year later, as shown by the Army Register of 1868, the Army had been allowed to run down to 53,964 men. That was the force in August, 1868. As the necessity of a military police in the late rebel States diminished, the rank and file of the Army has been allowed to decrease by not filling it by enlistments, until, on the 1st of January, 1893, a little more than five weeks ago, the full strength of the Army was 33,575 enlisted men and a few less than 3,000 commissioned officers.

But the new feature of Army legislation—that terrible sliding scale! Read the record of the laws of Congress on this subject. In nearly every act there is fixed by Congress a maximum and a minimum for the Army; and the Chief Executive of the nation, a coordinate branch of the Government, has been charged with the responsibility of filling it up to the maximum, or of letting it run down to the minimum. What is the obligation of a President? He shall execute the law as by his oath he is compelled to do, and he can not go beyond the law. But the opposition contend that it is an abrogation of the power of Congress, and that once gone can never be regained, and that they are fearful of placing so great a power in the hands of one man. If it be true that it is a yielding of the power of Congress, then that power has passed out of its hands long ago. If his predecessors have been intrusted with this responsible duty, why not trust President McKinley?

Mr. Speaker, President McKinley needs no defense from me. His whole life from boyhood to the present time; his early education and the influences that surrounded his early life; his services in battle in defense of the Constitution and the flag; his long service on this floor, and the confidence reposed in him by the people as chief magistrate of his native State; the firmness and prudence with which, as Chief Magistrate of the nation, he has met the present troubles in which our country is involved, all go to affirm the utter groundlessness of the insinuation that he is unworthy to be trusted with duties which history shows have been intrusted to his predecessors. There has not been a moment since he knew what the Constitution and the Union meant that he has not been in full sympathy with the people and the Government; and measured by the standard of statesmen, measured by any standard you may choose, there has not been a moment since he was first elected Chief Magistrate of the nation that he could not be fully intrusted with any powers Congress might see fit to confer on him.

The fear that the duties enjoined by this measure would enable a President to continue in force an army that would be dangerous to the liberties of the people, and the statement that no army in this country has ever been reduced by law, are alike without foundation. History shows that the Army often has been reduced and never increased in time of peace, except in an emergency such as the present. A brief recital of the history of the American Army and the acts of Congress bearing on it will not be out of place here:

SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF UNITED STATES ARMY.

On the 3d day of July, 1775, George Washington, by authority of the Continental Congress assembled at Philadelphia May 10, 1775, assumed command of the American Army then besieging Boston and which was composed of about 15,000 men fit for duty. This Army was organized by the appointment by Congress of four major-generals and eight brigadier-generals, and became known as the Continental Army. To the organization and discipline of this crude and unorganized body of men General Washington immediately addressed himself.

Thus the American Army commenced its career, originating in an effort on the part of the American colonists to free themselves from the oppressive laws of Great Britain in respect to trade and commerce. Discrimination against the American colonies had long existed, but between the years 1763 and 1775 laws were enacted to regulate trade so that all gain might accrue to the mother country and all losses might fall on the colonies. The colonies were required to confine their trade to Great Britain. No American colony could sell its produce in any country abroad except England, nor could they buy any commodity except from England, her authorized agents or merchants. Although American ships were permitted to carry American goods to England, the carrying trade between the different colonies was confined by law to British ships. Manufacturing in the colonies was prohibited. All raw material must be taken to England to be manufactured, and finally, to protect British farming interests, the infamous corn law was enacted, putting a prohibitive tax on all farm products of the colonists.

It was sought to enforce more rigidly the already too oppressive revenue laws, and to that end search warrants and writs of assistance were issued. This caused individual and stubborn resentment, and in many of the colonies open revolt, which was suppressed only after severe measures and bloodshed. Notable among these were the revolt of the colonies in the Carolinas, in New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and in Rhode Island, in April, 1770, when the citizens burned the revenue cutter *Gaspee*; and subsequently, on the 16th day of December, 1773, 7,000 people assembled in Boston to protest the unloading of a cargo of tea then lying in the harbor. This was the largest number of men theretofore assembled for a defensive purpose; and although the tea was thrown overboard, actual hostilities did not commence until the battle of Lexington and Concord, which was fought on the 19th day of April, 1775, followed by the siege of Boston by an army of not less than 13,000 men, when Washington assumed command.

The Continental Army was recuperated from time to time by voluntary enlistment from the different colonies, and among the recruits were found colored men from many of the colonies, including Virginia. In 1778 a plan proposed by Brigadier-General Varnum, of Rhode Island, for the emancipation of the slaves of that State on condition of their enlisting in the Army for service during the war, which, being approved by Washington and Governor Cooke, was put in execution. The plan was adopted by other colonies, notably in South Carolina and Georgia, where Congress commended the enlistment of 3,000 able-bodied negroes.

When Washington assumed command of the Army he found an unorganized mass of men, undisciplined, inexperienced, without money or matériel, to the organization of which he immediately addressed himself.

During the war of the Revolution, when Congress by resolution frequently directed the control of military affairs and issued all of the general and staff commissions, military and administrative affairs generally were conducted by a board of war, and this system continued until the adoption of the Constitution.

One of the first acts of Congress under the Constitution (act of August 9, 1789) was to authorize the establishment of a Department of War. To the War Department under this act was assigned the control of: (1) All military commissions; (2) the land and naval forces, ships, and warlike stores of the Government; (3) all matters generally pertaining to military and naval affairs; (4) the distribution of "bounty lands" to all soldiers and ex-soldiers entitled thereto; (5) Indian affairs, and (6) generally all such duties connected with these various affairs as might be assigned to the Department by the Chief Magistrate.

On the 8th day of May, 1792, Congress passed an act for the establishment of "an uniform militia throughout the United States." The act provided that the militia should be officered by the States as follows:

To each division, 1 major-general and 2 aids-de-camp with the rank of major; to each brigade, 1 brigadier-general, with 1 brigade inspector to serve also as brigade major with the rank of major; to each regiment, 1 lieutenant-colonel commandant; to each battalion, 1 major; to each company, 1 captain, 1 lieutenant, 1 ensign, 4 sergeants, 4 corporals, 1 drummer, and 1 fifer or bugler.

It was directed that the regimental staff should consist of 1 adjutant and 1 quartermaster, 1 surgeon and 1 surgeon's mate, 1 sergeant-major, 1 drum major, and 1 fife major.

This is a brief review of the first effort to erect a military establishment for the United States, and with this as a basis the establishment has been strengthened from time to time by Congress.

That large powers have been conferred on our Presidents from the very earliest history of our country and that the Army often has been reduced will appear by the following acts and resolutions:

On December 27, 1776, Congress by resolution conferred upon General Washington almost supreme command for the period of six months, and this power was continued until after the battle of Brandywine, September 11, 1777.

In February, 1778, Congress adopted, with some modifications, Washington's plan for forced draft to fill up the Army, which plan was carried into execution.

For the campaign of 1779 the infantry of the Continental Army was organized in 88 battalions, apportioned pro rata to the several States. There were four regiments of cavalry and 29 companies of artillery.

In February, 1790, Congress fixed the number of men at over 35,000, and the States were required to furnish the same by draft or otherwise.

The number of soldiers furnished for the Continental Army during the war of the Revolution was 231,791.

In a statement of the troops in the service of the United States, furnished by Secretary Knox, August 8, 1793, the establishment, as directed to be raised and organized by the acts of Congress of October 3, 1787, was given as one regiment of infantry, 500 men, and one battalion of artillery, 280 men; total, 840. The troops in actual service were two companies of artillery, one of which was stationed at the arsenal at Westpoint, on the Hudson River, and the other at Springfield, on the Connecticut River, 70 men; at the various points northwest of the Ohio, 500; wanting to complete the establishment, 168; total noncommissioned and privates, 840 men. All the troops were enlisted for three years. In 1790 the regiment of infantry and battalion of artillery included 1,216 men; in 1791 a second regiment was formed, increasing the total to 2,128. (Army and Navy of the United States.)

In 1793 the Army was increased to 6,000 men; in 1796 it was reduced to 2,800. In 1798, in apprehension of a war with France, Congress ordered an increase in the Army of 13,000. Washington was made Commander in Chief, with the rank of lieutenant-general, under the act of May 28.

In 1800, after the death of Washington, a proposition was made to entirely abolish the Army. John Randolph declared in Congress that the country could place no trust in "mercenary armies" and "a handful of ragamuffins." The Army remained at the normal strength of 3,400 men, and, 1802, was reduced to 3,000.

In 1808, in apprehension of a war with England, Congress authorized the equipment of 6,000 troops.

Gen. Winfield Scott, in his *Memoirs*, says:

The breaking out of the war 1812 found the military establishment of the country in such a disordered condition that the long train of blunders and defeats that signalized its course was inevitable.

Under the act of April 12, 1808, there was an increase in the Regular Army to 5 regiments of infantry, 1 of riflemen, 1 of artillery, and 1 of dragoons. On June 6, 1812, about the time of declaration of war with England, the entire Army consisted of 6,744 men inclusive of the staff. On December 2, 1811, Congress ordered an increase of 10,000 troops, doubled the bounty from \$8 to \$16, and authorized six months' pay and 160 acres of land to each honorably discharged soldier. Under the act of January 11, 1812, Congress authorized the enlistment of 10 regiments of infantry, 2 regiments of artillery, and 1 regiment of light dragoons for a term of five years. Under this law the maximum strength of the Army was 25,484 officers and men, exclusive of generals, field and staff officers. Each regiment of infantry contained 1,800 privates, each regiment of artillery 1,440 privates, each regiment of dragoons 960 privates. Each was provided with a full quota of line and noncommissioned officers and musicians. The act also provided for 2 major-generals, 5 brigadiers, an adjutant-general, and an inspector-general, each with the rank of brigadier-general; also a judge-advocate for each division of the Army, with the pay and emoluments of a major of infantry.

On the 1st day of May, 1813, the War Department issued "Rules and Regulations of the Army of the United States." The Register of the Army of 1813 appeared in December of that year. From these we find that the Army at that time consisted of the following organizations besides the staff departments: (1) The regiment of light artillery; (2) 2 regiments of dragoons; (3) First, Second, and Third regiments of light artillery; (4) 25 regiments of regular infantry; (5) the rifle regiment; (6) 14 regiments of one-year infantry; (7) 5 regiments of infantry enlisted for service "during the war;" (8) 12 companies of "rangers;" (9) 4 regiments, a battalion, and a company of "United States Volunteers," and (10) 5 companies of "Sea Fencibles." Under this arrangement the organization of the Regular Army would have given a force of 36,374 men, adding to which the one-year regiments and those enlisted for service "during the war" would have increased the total force to 58,254.

On the 1st of July, 1814, the whole enlisted Army of the United States consisted of 31,533 regular soldiers, of which 27,010 were effectives. Secretary of State and Acting Secretary of War Monroe, in his report to Congress of October 17, gives the amount of "the existing military establishment" as 62,448, and recommends the raising of a "permanent force" in addition of not less than 40,000. (Army and Navy of the United States.)

A report of the Secretary of War to Congress in 1821 shows that the aggregate number of militia called into service during the years 1812, 1813, and 1814 was 410,603.

Under the act of March 13, 1815, a few months after the battle of New Orleans, Congress ordered the reduction of the peace establishment to "such proportion of artillery, infantry, and riflemen, not exceeding in the whole 10,000, as the President shall judge proper." The Corps of Engineers as then established was retained, also the corps of artillery and the regiment of light artillery. The number of field officers then in the service was 216, and of regimental officers 2,055. Under general orders the aggregate of artillery was fixed at 3,200, the light artillery at 660, the infantry at 5,440, and the rifles at 660 privates and matrosses.

It is from this year—

Says the Comte de Paris—

that the existence in America of a regular army may be dated, comprising corps of all arms, systematically recruited, having a fixed system of promotion, and opening a legitimate career to officers, certain henceforth of retaining their respective grades.

The Army Register published January 18, 1816, shows a corps of engineers and 2 judge-advocates, 8 regiments of infantry, 1 regiment of riflemen, a regiment of light artillery, and the "corps of artillery." On the 1st of January, 1817, the entire number of officers and men, including all officers of the staff department and the Corps of Engineers, was 10,024.

The forces which were employed against the Seminoles in Florida consisted of 800 regular troops, 1,000 Georgia militiamen, 1,000 Tennessee volunteers, and 1,500 Indians.

Under the act of March 2, 1821, it was provided that the military peace establishment of the United States should be composed of 1 major-general, 2 brigadier-generals, 1 Adjutant-General, 2 inspectors-general, 1 Quartermaster-General, 2 quartermasters, 10 assistant quartermasters, 1 Commissary-General of Subsistence; as many "assistant commissaries" as the service might require, not exceeding 50, to be taken from the subalterns of the line; 1 Paymaster-General, 14 paymasters, 1 Surgeon-General, 8 surgeons, 45 assistant surgeons, 1 commissary of purchases, and 2 military storekeepers, "to be attached to the purchasing department." There were to be 4 regiments of artillery and 7 of infantry, the Corps of Engineers and the topographical engineers were to be retained, and provision was made for certain officers of engineers, of ordnance, and of the staff.

The Ordnance Department was merged in the artillery. The Army as thus organized contained neither cavalry, light artillery, or riflemen. When the Florida war broke out in 1834, a regiment of dragoons had been added to the Army, and in 1837 there were

two, which brought the strength of the Army up to 7,958 officers and enlisted men (about 0.12 soldier to 1,000 population).

For the increase of the Regular Army during 1846-47, 10 additional regiments were authorized. Of these 1 was to be of dragoons, 1 of foot riflemen and voltigeurs, and 8 of infantry.

A report of the Adjutant-General to the Secretary of War, November 30, 1847, gives the authorized regular military establishment as follows:

Designation of corps and troops of the line.	Commissioned officers.	Noncommissioned officers, musicians, artificers, privates, etc.	Aggregate.
General officers	11	11
General staff	75	75
Medical Department, 10 regimental surgeons and 20 assistant surgeons of the new establishment included	115	115
Pay Department	31	31
Officers of the Corps of Engineers	43	43
Officers of the Corps of Topographical Engineers	36	36
Officers of the Ordnance Department	36	36
Military storekeepers	17	17
Aggregate	347	17	364
Three regiments of dragoons	118	3,408	3,526
One regiment of mounted riflemen	35	1,146	1,181
Four regiments of artillery	208	5,462	5,700
Sixteen regiments of infantry and foot riflemen	648	17,684	18,312
One regiment of voltigeurs	47	1,104	1,151
Aggregate troops of the line	1,056	28,814	29,870
One company of engineer soldiers, sappers, miners, and pontoniers	100	100
Orderly sergeants	46	46
Aggregate of authorized force	1,372	28,960	30,332

The report adds:

According to the latest returns, which are not of recent date, and estimates made, the rank and file in all the regiments (enlisted men) does not exceed 20,333, leaving a deficiency in the companies of 8,481 privates to be supplied.

The "volunteer forces of the war" are given as follows:

General officers	7
Staff officers, Quartermaster's Department (5 majors, 26 captains)	31
Commissary Department (5 majors, 23 captains)	29
Medical Department (25 surgeons, 29 assistant surgeons)	54
Additional paymasters (under section 25, act July 5, 1838)	12

Total general and staff officers provided for the volunteer troops in commission at this time

The aggregate regular and volunteer forces in campaign is given as 43,530. The distribution of the troops in the field is as follows: Of the army in Mexico, under the command or orders of Winfield Scott, major-general, commander in chief—including the garrisons at Vera Cruz and Tampico—aggregate of regular troops, according to latest returns and estimates made, 17,101. "Of this force not less than 10,851 are recruits, enlisted, for the most part, since the 4th of March." Aggregate volunteer troops, according to the latest returns and estimates made, 15,055. Of the "army of occupation," under Brig. Gen. John E. Walton, next in rank to Major-General Taylor, temporarily absent on leave, regulars, general staff included, 3,657; volunteers, general staff (30) included, 2,790; aggregate, 6,447. Under Brigadier-General Price, commanding in New Mexico, Santa Fe, 3,157. On the Oregon route, Lieut. Col. L. E. Howell, commanding battalion Missouri Mounted Volunteers, headquarters Fort Kearney, Upper Missouri, 479. Under Col. R. B. Mason, First Dragoons, commanding in California, headquarters Monterey, 1,019.

The inconveniences attending the short terms of service for which the volunteers sometimes enlisted were occasionally very great, as at Jalapa, where General Scott, waiting for reinforcements, and not having received any, was obliged to discharge 4,000 volunteers whose time was about to expire.

At the close of the war with Mexico the aggregate strength of the Army was rated at 47,150 officers and men, of which 1,338 were officers and 22,695 were enlisted men of the Regular Army, the volunteer forces consisting of 1,527 officers and 21,500 men. After the President's proclamation of July 4, 1848, announcing the close of hostilities, the Army was reduced to the regular peace establishment, limited by law to 865 commissioned officers and 8,940 enlisted men. (Census 1850, about one-fourth soldier to 1,000 population.)

Under the act of Congress of March 3, 1855, the Army was organized as follows: One major-general and 3 brigadiers, to whom were allowed, in all, 5 aids-de-camp; an Adjutant-General's Department; a Judge-Advocate, an Inspector-General's, a Quartermaster's, a Subsistence, a Medical, Pay, and an Ordnance Department; a Corps of Engineers, and one of topographical engineers; 2 regiments of dragoons, 2 of cavalry, 1 of mounted riflemen, 4 of artillery, 10 of infantry, and 67 unattached ordnance sergeants; a total of 1,040 commissioned officers and 11,658 enlisted men. The aggregates were increased in 1860 to 1,083 officers and 12,931 enlisted men. About one-fourth soldier to 1,000 population.

The President's proclamation of April 15, 1861, called for State militia to the number of 75,000, nearly five times the strength of

the then existing Regular Army. This call was made under the act of February 28, 1795. On the 4th of May, 1861, the President issued a call for 42,000 more troops.

In response to this call 208 regiments were organized, of which 153, with an aggregate of 188,000 men, were mustered into service. The President at the same time, May 4, 1861, without authority of Congress (an act afterwards sanctioned by Congress), added a regiment of cavalry, a regiment of artillery, and 8 regiments of infantry. At the beginning of the war the Regular Army, by law, consisted of 2 regiments of dragoons, 2 regiments of cavalry, 1 regiment of mounted rifles, 4 regiments of artillery, and 10 regiments of infantry, admitting of an aggregate strength of 13,024, officers and men. Adding to this number the forces ordered by President Lincoln on May 4, 1861, the Regular Army comprised an admitted strength of 39,973. At no time during the civil war did the Regular Army attain a strength of 25,000 men.

In May and June, 1862, calls were issued for 15,000 men for three months' service under the act of 1795. On July 17, 1862, Congress authorized the raising of new regiments of volunteers not to exceed 100,000 men. Congress authorized the drafting of men to fill up the Army by the act of April 18, 1862, "for the enrollment of the national forces." President Lincoln issued calls for volunteers at comparatively short intervals during the latter years of the war—in September, 1863, he called for 30,000 men; in July, 1864, for 300,000; in December, 1864, for 200,000 to complete the war.

On the 1st of March, 1865, the muster rolls of the Army showed an aggregate force of 965,591 men, of whom 602,593 were present for duty, and 132,538 were on detached service. The aggregate force was increased, by enlistments, by the 1st of May to 1,516,000 of all arms, officers and men. The whole number of men called into service during the war was 2,565,553. Of these about 1,490,000 were in actual service. (Army and Navy of the United States.)

In the final report of the Provost-Marshal-General the aggregate strength of the Army, regulars and volunteers, at different periods of the war, was given as follows:

July 1, 1861	186,751
January 1, 1862	575,917
March 31, 1862	637,125
January 1, 1863	918,101
January 1, 1864	860,737
January 1, 1865	959,900
March 31, 1865	980,088
May 1, 1865	1,000,516

The records of the War Department show the following figures relative to the civil war:

Number of soldiers enlisted during the war, exclusive of reenlistments	2,213,365
Number killed in battle and by other casualties, and who died of disease prior to July 1, 1865	364,116
Number of desertions	121,896
Number of survivors of the war, July 1, 1865, less deaths and desertions	1,702,069
Total number of survivors January 1, 1860	1,246,089

The organization of the Army under the act of Congress of July 28, 1866, was as follows:

One general; 1 lieutenant-general; 5 major-generals; 10 brigadier-generals; 1 chief of staff to the general; 1 military secretary to the lieutenant-general; 43 aids-de-camp to general officers; 9 inspector-generals, of whom 4 were colonels, 3 lieutenant-colonels, and 2 majors; an Adjutant-General's Department, a bureau of military justice, a Quartermaster's Department, a Subsistence Department, a Medical Department, a Pay Department, the Corps of Engineers, and Ordnance Department, the chiefs of all these ranking as brigadier-generals; a Chief Signal Officer, with the rank of colonel; 30 post chaplains; 10 regiments of cavalry of 12 companies each; 5 regiments of artillery of 12 companies each; 45 regiments of infantry of 10 companies each, 4 of these regiments being of the Veteran Reserve Corps; 15 brigade or post bands, with an aggregate of 360 musicians, and 115 officers of the noncommissioned staff unattached to regiments.

The total number of companies in the infantry, cavalry, and artillery regiments was 630; the minimum strength of the companies as allowed by law was 50 privates in the infantry and cavalry and 64 privates each in the 50 companies of artillery not mounted, and 123 privates each in the 10 mounted companies. The maximum strength to which the companies might be increased at the discretion of the President was 100 privates in the infantry and cavalry and 123 in the artillery. If all the regiments were increased to the full complement allowed by law, the total number of enlisted men would be 77,259, and the grand aggregate 80,258. In addition to the enlisted men Indian scouts to the number of 1,000 might be employed in the Territories and Indian country, they to receive the pay and allowance of cavalry soldiers.

Under the act of March 3, 1869, the grand aggregate was given at 37,313 men. Under the act of July 15, 1870, there were still further reductions of some 2,000 men, and it was further provided that on or before July 1, 1871, the number of enlisted men should be reduced to 30,000 and the number of major-generals to 3 and of brigadier-generals to 6. Under the act of July 16, 1874, the Army was reduced to 25,000 men; and as organized under this

act and of subsequent ones of 1874, 1875, and 1876 the grand aggregate is given at 27,472 men. The number of infantry regiments remained at 25, of cavalry at 10, and of artillery at 5.

The Adjutant-General's report shows that at the close of the previous fiscal year, June 30, 1875, the Army was distributed through the four military divisions as follows:

	Number of troops.
Division of Missouri	14,841
Division of the Atlantic	2,044
Division of the Pacific	3,704
Division of the South	1,859
Total	22,448

As organized in 1889, the Army contained 3 major-generals and 6 brigadiers, with 21 aids-de-camp attached to their service. The troops of engineers consisted of 109 officers and 500 men; the Ordnance Department, 54 officers, 450 men; the Signal Corps, 15 officers and 320 men, and there were 30 post chaplains, ranking as captains of infantry. The 10 regiments of cavalry consisted of 432 officers and 7,970 men; the 5 regiments of artillery, of 280 officers and 2,650 men; the 25 regiments of infantry, of 877 officers and 12,625 men. The total aggregate strength of the Army was given as 28,417.

As approved by the Secretary of War, October, 1890, the organization of the Army of the United States is given as follows: 200 companies of infantry, 100 troops of cavalry, and 60 batteries of artillery (50 heavy and 10 light), the aggregate being 24,215 and the authorized enlisted strength 25,000.

That the situation in the Philippines will require a large part of the Army there, no one will dispute; but there are other reasons why the efficiency of our military establishment, even on a peace basis, should be increased. We have the most extensive seacoast, with the largest number of commercial cities, growing in wealth, of any country in the world. On the Atlantic coast and Gulf of Mexico alone we have many important points, from Maine to Texas, which an enemy's navy could utterly destroy; and our Pacific coast is equally extensive and exposed. Our new possessions have extended our territory and made necessary additional arms even in a time of profound peace. Not only have we not had a sufficient rank and file, but the Army has been deficient in the number of officers, the assertion to the contrary notwithstanding. Our most careful and conservative Army officers, charged by Congress with the care of the men and matériel in our forts and garrisons, estimate that the Army is largely deficient in officers; and any fewer officers and men than is provided in this bill would be inadequate to our present needs and possible emergencies.

As far back as 1817 John C. Calhoun, then Secretary of War, contending for an increase in our peace establishment and referring to the establishment under the act of 1813, when the Army was on a peace basis of 10,000 to a population of less than 8,000,000, urged the increase in population, which at that time did not exceed 9,000,000, being an increase of only 1,000,000, as one reason for an increase of the Army; and the increase of our territory by the Louisiana purchase, the extension of our frontier, and the increasing wealth of our commercial seacoast cities as another reason. Since that time we have acquired Texas and all our Southwest and Western territory, including Alaska. Our population is ten times greater now than it was then, and our commercial cities are vastly greater, both in population and wealth, than they were in 1813. If the growth of population, the increase of our territory, our frontier, and the increased number and wealth of our commercial cities were in 1817 good grounds for an increase in the Regular Army, on a peace basis, how much greater the necessity for an enlarged peace establishment at this time, with a population of 76,000,000—nearly ten times greater than it was in 1813—being an increase over the population in 1817 of over 67,000,000? In 1817, bear in mind, we had about 1½ soldiers to 1,000 population—1 to 1,500 population. Mr. Calhoun said:

To consider the present Army (1 soldier to 1,500 population) as dangerous to our liberty partakes, it is conceived, more of timidity than wisdom.

It costs more to maintain an American soldier than that of any other nation on earth, because he is freer; he is not an automaton; he has the right to exercise his intelligence, to think, and, in a great measure, to act for himself; and therefore on account of his education and his habits of life before entering the service he can not and should not be abandoned to the scant, restricted allowance of the soldier of countries less free than ours.

And Mr. Calhoun further says:

However well qualified for war in other respects, in the mere capacity of bearing privations we are inferior to most nations. * * * In fact, barbarous and oppressed nations have in this particular a striking advantage, which, however, ought to be more than compensated by the skill and resources of a free and civilized people. If, however, such a people want the skill and spirit to direct the resources to its defense, the very wealth by which it ought to defend itself becomes the motive for invasion and conquest.

Whether justly or not, my colleague from Massachusetts counts in the cost of maintaining the Army provided for in this bill of less than 100,000 our pension appropriation of \$145,000,000, resulting from an enlistment of more than 2,000,000 men. On the basis

of the present pension appropriation a fair estimate of a pension roll resulting from an enlistment of 100,000, one-half of which may not be called into active service outside of the limits of the United States proper, and free from the casualties incident to battle, would not exceed \$10,000,000, which would still keep us fourth in the list of nations. But the cost counts in opposite directions—for the Government and against the Government.

Examine the history of all nations. Take the Netherlands, for instance, of which Holland is the most important province. The Netherlands is one of the pioneers of expansion. In her Dutch prudence, foresight, and Dutch economy she saw the value of a footing in the Tropics, and as early as 1602 she created the Dutch East India Company, "went forth to conquer," and did conquer the East Indies; and to-day her possessions in the East Indies contain a population of 35,000,000, seven times greater than that of the mother country. Java alone, the center of trade in the Dutch East Indies, has a population of more than 25,000,000, and the other island possessions of the Netherlands more than 10,000,000. The native population of Java is made up of Malays and other oriental peoples, like the Philippines.

Under Dutch rule this people have become a civilized and to a large extent a Christian people—a blessing to themselves and a benefit to the whole civilized world. But it is not only in expansion the Netherlands has demonstrated her wisdom; she has had the foresight to see to it that her vast interests are protected by an ample army. She to-day maintains an army of 29,000 on a peace basis, to a population of about 5,000,000—five times greater in proportion to her population than the army provided by this measure is to our population. Now, this is the cost that counts for the Government. The cost of catering to a prejudice against a regular army, it is seen, in all our foreign wars has been immense. The cost of maintaining an army at the rate of one-fourth soldier to 1,000 population from 1856 to 1860 cost the Government billions of dollars, which could have been avoided by maintaining an adequate regular army. That is the cost that counted the other way. By a policy of false economy, the policy the opposition are now trying to force on us, the people of this country have been made to bear a most unnecessary burden for thirty years. And I am borne out in this by the testimony of our first generals and military experts. In his testimony before the House Military Committee in 1898 General Miles says:

I think we have learned something in that time. I think we have learned this, that if we had an effective force of 60,000 men we could have saved the expense of calling out nearly 225,000 men, equipping them, and organizing them, and all the trouble and enormous expense we have had in the last year in equipping an irregular and unprepared force, which has not been to war at all, but which has been in camp. I will not say 60,000, because really it required more than that. It required 52,000 men to go to foreign countries and meet the enemy, and at the same time we were compelled to keep at home a sufficient force to defend our extensive coast and as a support for the artillery force. It would not do to leave the harbors without artillerymen; it would not do to leave the batteries without support; so, to come right back to where I started, I still believe that Congress can fix a standard for its military force that will last for one hundred years without any modification, as far as I can see in the future.

Continuing, he said further:

I believe in making it so small that it can not be in any way a menace to any of the interests of the American people, and I believe in making it large enough to preserve our interests and protect our welfare, and be respected in case we require it in our intercourse with other nations.

And I call attention to General Hancock's testimony before the Military Committee, in 1878:

We rely upon creating armies from our population when the necessity for them has actually arisen or is impending. But "In peace prepare for war" is an accepted and respected maxim among us. Under the operations of these somewhat contradictory principles we have been led to the compromise of a small standing Army, which is expected to keep pace with the progress of the profession, construct adequate and suitable national defenses, hold some of our most important military positions, preventing their sudden seizure by an enemy, his occupation of our harbors and destruction of our great commercial cities; be prepared at all times to supply the national forces with the most improved weapons, implements, and munitions of war, and to guard these and other public property until distributed for service; be ready at a moment's notice to organize, equip, and supply, with efficiency and economy, armies of any magnitude which the occasion may call for, and, lastly, to serve as a nucleus for the law levies raised as needed.

The most specific testimony on this subject was given before the Military Committee in 1876, by Maj. Thomas M. Vincent, afterwards colonel and assistant adjutant-general, and Maj. Samuel Breck, afterwards brevet brigadier-general and adjutant-general.

Colonel Vincent says:

Our staff is not merely for the Regular Army, but it should be viewed as the national military staff, applicable alike to the regular, volunteer, and militia forces; and it should be organized and trained in time of peace, so as to be adequate to the wants of an army suddenly called into service.

The staff and line—our peace establishment—are maintained for the acquirement and preservation of military knowledge and to perfect military discipline, to construct defenses and organize the material necessary in war, and generally to form the stock, in all its parts, on which an army competent to the defense of the country may be ingrafted.

Past experience has pointed to the following facts: The saving in clothing, provisions, arms, and other things, by not being compelled to call out militia or volunteers, would amply supply a considerable force which, well officered, would be daily improving; the expenses of militia and volunteers in variably exceed those of the regulars by several hundred per cent; the Black Hawk and Florida wars necessitated 55,000 militia and an expenditure of \$30,000,000,

and would have been avoided in each case had there been two regiments of regulars available for early service; a well-organized available force of 12,000 would have enabled the Government to avoid the Mexican war and its consequent expenditure of millions of dollars and a large sacrifice of human life; and the recent rebellion would have been stayed by an available force of a few thousand men. * * * The magnitude attained by the rebellion is the most instructive, for the public debt and money paid to pensioners * * * would maintain our present force, costing, say, \$30,000,000 yearly, for ninety-nine and two-thirds years. Now, however, and as a result of temporary economy, we have to pay the debt, expend nearly \$30,000,000 yearly for pensions, and support a military establishment costing \$30,000,000; consequently we have lost, by not having an available force to prevent rebellion, the enormous amount of \$2,938,447,641.49. * * *

The opinion of our trained and most skillful military men, the history and experience of all foreign nations, and our experience at home all go to prove the folly, in the name of economy, of not providing adequate protection in time of peace against possible danger.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the most rigid economy and retrenchment wherever possible in the administration and management of the Army. I would not vote for the employment of a single soldier or the expenditure of a single dollar beyond what is absolutely necessary for the protection of our interests and the safety of our country; but I believe this measure comes within the range of adequate protection, and I trust it will pass.

But the gentleman from Massachusetts attempts to show that because our trade with the Philippines has not equaled the cost of holding the islands up to the present time, therefore we ought to abandon them. Comparing them with the North American Indians, he concludes that our trade will never reach a paying basis. Trade is the outgrowth of enterprise, and does not reach a paying basis in a day. Our immense foreign trade of to-day is the result of the growth of a century of persistent, aggressive enterprise of our merchants and traders.

In considering the Philippines from a commercial and business standpoint, we must take into consideration not merely what we can sell to the people of those islands, but what we can buy from them, what field they offer to our business men and young men, whether they will enable us to expend among our own people any considerable sum which we now expend in other countries, and what the effect of their control will be upon our commerce and commercial standing throughout that part of the world.

First, it may be said that the market which the islands alone will offer is small when compared with the market which the world or even the Orient offers, but the growth of our exports to the Philippines since the United States assumed control of the islands is no inconsiderable factor, while the history of England's trade with the Orient following her control of Hongkong as a distributing point justifies a broader view of the Philippines and the commercial opportunities which their control offers.

England's exports to China, Japan, and Hongkong amounted to but half a million pounds sterling per annum when she obtained control of Hongkong in 1843. Gradually making it a distributing point for her commerce, by 1850 her exports to Hongkong and China had increased to one and one-half million pounds sterling (or about \$7,500,000); by 1860 they amounted to five and one-half million pounds sterling (or about \$37,500,000); by 1870 her exports to China, Japan, and Hongkong were over ten million pounds sterling (or about \$50,000,000); by 1880, thirteen million pounds (or in round terms about \$65,000,000); in 1890 and 1898 the amount was about the same as in 1880.

It is not assumed, of course, that the growth in England's exports to the Orient is entirely due to her control of Hongkong as a distributing center and base of operations, but the fact that her exports to China, Japan, and Hongkong increased more than a thousand fold in the thirty-five years after she had obtained control of that point, and that her gain from 1843 to 1880 was much greater than that of any other nation, is at least suggestive to us in considering what the effect of a central distributing point such as Manila would be to our commerce in that part of the world.

The fact that the exports of the United Kingdom to China, Japan, and Hongkong grew about \$80,000,000 in the quarter of a century following its control of Hongkong as a commercial base, and that those of the United States to those countries during the same time increased only about \$10,000,000, seems to strengthen the theory that an advantage is to be found in a fixed base of operations in the section where the trade is sought. The United States made her treaty of commerce with China very soon after England opened the doors of that country to the world, and England followed close behind the United States when our own Perry opened the doors of Japan, yet England's gain with a commercial entrepôt in that locality was nearly six times as great as our own during the quarter of a century after its occupancy by the English Government.

On this subject I desire to quote a statement made by Admiral Bradford before the peace commission at Paris, October 14, 1898, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not think a commercial station in those islands is much more valuable to the United States, with a view to its trade in China and Japan and other parts of that sea, than it is with reference to any trade with the islands themselves?

Answer. I think a commercial station at the Philippines valuable for that purpose; how valuable depends largely upon our influence in China. The balance of trade there has been against us. Foreign powers seem to be at present in control of Chinese affairs, and if they are able to discriminate against us our trade may not be valuable.

Q. If the United States is to have a hand in the Chinese trade, our location in Manila and Luzon would be very valuable in that direction?

A. Very, indeed.

Q. And probably much more valuable than any interisland trade would be?

A. It ought to be. It would be fatal to profit if our trade with China was obliged to pass through foreign hands.

Q. Have you any means of estimating the value of these islands; and if so, will you give us an estimate, supposing they were to be acquired by purchase?

A. No, sir; I have none.

Q. You mean you could not form any estimate?

A. I do not think I could.

Q. You might form an estimate, possibly?

A. I can only state that which you already know, viz, the price paid for Alaska and that asked for the Dutch Islands in the West Indies.

Q. Suppose, to put it in another way, you were taking this group of islands as a war indemnity, could you form an estimate as to how much you were getting?

A. It is a subject I have not studied. I did not expect to be asked to give an opinion on such matters, and I should prefer not to do so until I can study the question. I will say I think them extremely valuable, both from a commercial and from a military point of view.

In the mere matter of the markets which the islands will supply to our manufacturers and producers they are worthy of serious consideration. Our exports to the Philippines have increased from \$69,000 in 1897 to \$3,500,000 in 1900, omitting from this statement the supplies sent by this Government to its troops in the islands. In 1899 we furnished about 6 per cent of the total imports of the islands, and in 1900 it seems likely that we shall have furnished about 15 per cent, with a greater total than any other source of supply except that which comes from China and Hongkong.

It should also be remembered that the Philippines can supply a large proportion of the articles of tropical growth which are now imported into the United States, and for which we are now sending to other countries more than \$300,000,000 a year. Sugar, coffee, tea, rubber, hemp, tobacco, and other articles of this class form a very important part of our importations, now that we are able to confine our importations largely to the class of articles which we can not produce at home, and nearly all of those are produced abundantly in the Philippines; and their productions may be indefinitely increased. In eleven months of the year 1900 we have sent to the Dutch East Indies, which lie just alongside the Philippines, more than \$16,000,000 for sugar, and in the corresponding months of 1899 the amount was \$27,000,000.

The Philippines can produce sugar as readily as their neighbors, the Dutch East Indies, from which sugar comes, and can produce it with the investment of American capital. Why should we not pay this money to our people and add to it the sums which we also send to that part of the world for coffee, tobacco, hemp, and other articles of that class which we can not, or at least do not at present, produce at home, and which can be produced in these islands? We have sent abroad in the year 1900, in round figures, \$90,000,000 for sugar, \$60,000,000 for coffee, \$30,000,000 for raw silk, \$30,000,000 for rubber, more than \$10,000,000 for hemp and jute, \$12,000,000 for tea, and \$17,000,000 for tobacco, also \$18,000,000 for tin, much of which comes from the immediate vicinity of the Philippines and which it is not unlikely we may be able to obtain from those islands by proper exploration and research.

It is argued that the Philippine Islands are not likely to ever become centers of trade, and that the "average inhabitant is not likely to be a better customer than the American Indian." Similar arguments were used when our Western and Southwestern Territories and Alaska were taken possession of by our Government. But we did not depend upon the Indians as customers; and yet these additions to our territory have grown into a mighty and wealthy empire. But the anti-imperialists, so called, are divided in their councils. On the one hand we have the anti-expansionist, holding that the average inhabitant of the Philippine Islands is no better than the North American Indian, who, everyone knows and acknowledges, never was capable of self-government, yet holding that the Filipino, who, it is claimed, is no better, should be granted self-government. On the other hand we have the so-called anti-imperialist, who believes that the archipelago should be retained by the United States for the good of the Filipinos, as well as for our own profit, yet who is opposed to holding them by force. Could we have held the Louisiana purchase against the claims of the native Indians except by force?

Going further than a mere business proposition, and looking at the subject from a more sentimental point of view, considering the history of all civilized nations, they all, from Greece and Rome to the present, have had a just pride in their language and their institutions, and every one of them from time to time have spent millions in extending their civilizations, their language, and their institutions; and it is not singular that the American people should feel a like pride in our civilization, our language, and our institutions; nor that they should feel it a duty to extend them even to the dark places on the earth.

In speaking of the sacrifices of England in extending constitutional liberty, General Garfield in a speech in Congress June 25, 1874, in part said:

There were two periods in the history of that contest when England saw darker days than any we have seen, or, I hope, ever shall see. Consider her condition in 1797. For ten years the tide of mad revolution had been sweeping over Europe like a destroying pestilence, demolishing thrones and principalities; and, while many evils were swept away, chaos and anarchy were left in its track. In 1792 France declared war against the world; and in February, 1793, specifically declared war against England. At that time the British debt was \$1,268,000,045, and its annual interest \$45,225,304. The population of the United Kingdom was less than 12,000,000, including Ireland—Ireland then, as now, "the tear in the eye of Great Britain"—a source of weakness rather than strength. The spirit of revolution pervaded the Kingdom from collieries to court. The throne distrusted the people, and the people were jealous of the throne. In 1794 the habeas corpus act was suspended, against an opposition in Parliament more determined and far abler than its suspension met in our Congress two years ago.

In 1793 three and a quarter million Catholics in Ireland were organized to revolt against the Government, to be aided by a French fleet of 40 sail, with 25,000 French soldiers on board. But for the storm which dispersed the fleet the revolt must have been successful. In the same year the naval power of England was threatened with dissolution by a widespread mutiny in the fleet. Ship after ship deserted the fleet off Cadiz and in the North Sea. The Channel fleet ran up the red flag of mutiny from almost every masthead and was drawn in line of battle across the mouth of the Thames, prepared to sail to London if the demands of the mutineers were not acceded to. It required all the firmness of the King and his Government to save the city and navy. In 1797, oppressed with financial disaster, the Bank of England suspended specie payments, and paper money (an immense circulation of which crowded the country) was the legal currency for twenty-two years thereafter.

But England saw darker days than those of 1797. In the beginning of 1812 Napoleon had risen to the height of his marvelous power. The Continent of Europe was at his feet. By victorious diplomacy and still more victorious war he had founded an Empire which seemed to defy human power successfully to assail it. Every coalition against him had been broken; every alliance had failed. More than half the nations of Europe followed his conquering eagles. From the Vistula to the Pillars of Hercules, except the rocky triangle of the Torres Vedras, where Wellington was held at bay by five times his number under a great marshal of France, the Continent presented an unbroken front against England. Russia remained in frozen isolation, a spectator of the contest. Only Prussia and Austria followed the lead of England. Let us consider her condition at this second crisis of her fate.

Her population, including Ireland, was about 17,000,000. Her debt had been more than trebled since the beginning of the war, and now reached the enormous sum of \$4,000,000,000. Specie being still suspended, her paper currency was more than ever expended. In the beginning of the war she raised from her mines and coined about \$30,000,000 in gold. But the revolution which swept over South America had stopped the working of the mines, so that before the close of the war the annual British coinage was less than \$12,000,000. Her navy was crippled by the war, her commerce ruined by the French decrees and the nonimportation act of the United States. Her imports exceeded her exports by \$65,000,000, and the balance was paid in gold.

For two years her harvest had failed, and in 1812 she paid \$21,000,000 in gold for foreign grain to feed her people. In that year alone her exports declined \$100,000,000. The heavy subsidies to her allies and the payments to her own armies on the Continent were in gold. In 1812 she sent \$50,000,000 in gold, for which she paid 30 per cent premium, to Wellington's army in the peninsula. Her bonds had so depreciated that a loan of £60 increased her debt £100. A short time previous, in the midst of increasing disaster, the reason of the King gave way, and he sat a lunatic on the throne of a Kingdom which seemed ready to go down with him in the general ruin. This event added a new and complicated question to the distractions of Parliament and gave a new weapon to the opposition.

It is not necessary for my present purpose to inquire whether justice leaned to the side of England or her adversary. It is enough to know that she believed it was on her part a struggle for self-existence and for the constitutional liberty of the world. Inspired with this conviction, she stood like a giant at bay. In high debate she reasserted the justice of her cause, summoned anew not the frantic energy of despair, but the inexhaustible reserve of calm, Anglo-Saxon courage, unfathomed resources of English faith and English pluck (a proud share of which I trust this nation has inherited), and in the face of unexampled discouragements and appalling disaster, laying under contribution all the resources of her realm, went out again to meet the man of destiny whose victories were numbered by hundreds, and whose eagles were followed by half the world. Increasing both taxes and loans, she raised and expended in that year \$550,000,000.

She filled her navy to 125,000 men, and before the year had ended 618,000 men were arrayed under her banners. Seconded by this indomitable spirit of her people, her armies emerged from the gloom of that nineteenth year of the war, and, marching with unflinching step through three more bloody years and the carnage of Waterloo, she planted her victorious standards on the battlements of Paris and gave peace to Europe.

And we can see the descendants of such a people. With such a history and such an example before us, can we—dare we—falter in a day like this? Dare we doubt? Should we not rather say, as Bolingbroke said to his people in their hour of peril: "Oh, woe to thee when doubt comes! It blows like a wind from the north and makes all thy joints to quake. Woe, indeed, be to the statesmen who doubt the strength of their country and stand in awe of the enemy with whom it is engaged!"

Mr. Speaker, viewing the present situation from any point, either as our rightful ownership of and sovereignty over the archipelago, as a commercial question, or as the more sentimental question of extending Christian civilization, our language, and our institutions, the Government is clearly right; and to retreat or even halt in our advance would be the beginning of decay and dissolution. Our new possessions have brought with them, whether foreseen or not, new burdens and responsibilities, and our refusal to bear them would disgrace us in the eyes of the world and humiliate our people.

In conclusion, by way of setting forth in brief form the glorious feats of our Army and Navy during the recent war with Spain, and giving an idea of the great responsibility assumed and discharged by the War Department and its bureaus, and the work

performed during that eventful period, I submit herewith the following important historical data compiled from official sources:

FACTS RELATING TO THE WAR DEPARTMENT SINCE THE DECLARATION OF WAR WITH SPAIN AND OTHER IMPORTANT HISTORICAL AND OFFICIAL INFORMATION.

Summary of the principal events connected with the war with Spain and military operations in the Philippine Islands.

- 1898.
- Jan. 25. The U. S. battle ship *Maine* enters and anchors in Habana Harbor.
- Feb. 15. The *Maine* destroyed by an explosion in Habana Harbor.
17. A commission, under the presidency of Capt. W. T. Sampson, named to proceed to the scene of the *Maine* disaster for the purpose of reaching an impartial conclusion as to the cause of the explosion and reporting this to the Government.
26. The Asiatic Squadron is directed to assemble at Hongkong.
- Mar. 8. Act of Congress increases the artillery arm of the service by two regiments.
9. Congress appropriates \$50,000,000 for the national defense, to be expended at the discretion of the President.
21. The court of inquiry appointed to inquire into the loss of the battle ship *Maine* finds that the ship was destroyed by the explosion of a submarine mine.
- Apr. 12. The President sends message to Congress requesting authority to take measures to secure a full and final termination of hostilities between the Government of Spain and the people of Cuba.
- 18-19. Conference committee agreed upon a final report, which declared independence of Cuba, demanded withdrawal by Spain, and directed the President to use the Army and Navy to enforce this demand, and pledged the United States to leave the people of Cuba free after expulsion of Spain. Report adopted in Senate by a vote of 42 to 35 and in the House by a vote of 310 to 6.
- 18-19. The President orders Acting Rear-Admiral W. T. Sampson, commanding North Atlantic Squadron, to blockade the north coast of Cuba, particularly Habana, and Cienfuegos on the south coast.
20. Act of Congress demands that Spain relinquish her authority in Cuba.
20. Minister Woodford, at Madrid, instructed to lay the ultimatum of the United States before the Spanish Government and demand an answer by the 23d of April.
20. President McKinley presents ultimatum of the United States to Spain.
20. The Spanish minister at Washington asks for and receives his passports.
20. Queen Regent delivers speech declaring her Parliament is summoned to defend country's rights and son's throne.
20. Joint resolution of Congress demands that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba.
21. Minister Woodford presents the ultimatum of the United States to the authorities at Madrid, and is given his passports by the Government.
21. Act of Congress declares a state of war with Spain to exist.
22. President declares a blockade of the north coast of Cuba, including all ports on that coast between Cardenas and Bahia Honda and the port of Cienfuegos, on the south coast of Cuba.
23. President issues proclamation calling for 125,000 volunteers.
23. United States consul at Manila is given his passports and leaves for Hongkong.
24. The Secretary of the Navy orders Dewey, Hongkong, China, to proceed to the Philippine Islands and destroy or capture the Spanish fleet in those waters.
25. Asiatic Squadron leaves Hongkong for Mirs Bay, China.
25. Congress formally declares that a state of war has existed since the 21st instant.
26. War with Spain formally declared. Regular Army increased to 63,106 men.
27. United States consul reaches Hongkong from Manila and joins the Asiatic Squadron at Mirs Bay. The American squadron sails for the Philippines.
29. U. S. S. *Marblehead* and *Eagle* engage and disable Spanish gunboat *Galicia* off Cienfuegos, Cuba.
29. Spanish mail steamer *Argonauta* captured off coast of Cuba by U. S. S. *Nashville*.
- May 1. The Asiatic Squadron, United States Navy, under command of Commodore Dewey, engages and destroys the Spanish squadron, under command of Admiral Montojo, in the bay of Manila.
2. Landing party of sailors and marines destroys several magazines in the vicinity of Cavite.
3. The Cavite Arsenal is abandoned by the Spanish and occupied by forces from the squadron.
16. Maj. Gen. Wesley Merritt, U. S. A., assigned to command of the Department of the Pacific.
20. The French cable to Cuba is cut by the U. S. S. *St. Louis*.
25. President issues proclamation calling for an additional 75,000 volunteers.
25. First expedition sails for Manila from San Francisco, Cal., under command of Brig. Gen. T. M. Anderson, U. S. V. This expedition comprised the First California Volunteer Infantry, Second Oregon Volunteer Infantry, 5 companies of the Fourteenth United States Infantry, and a detachment of California Volunteer Artillery.
30. Major-General Shafter directed to embark his command on transports at Tampa, Fla., and proceed under convoy of the Navy to the vicinity of Santiago de Cuba, and commence immediately upon the reduction of the defenses of the city, and, with the assistance of the fleet, capture or destroy the Spanish fleet in the harbor.
30. General Merritt arrives at San Francisco and assumes direction of the expeditionary forces.
- June 1. Admiral Sampson arrives with his squadron off the entrance to the harbor of Santiago.
3. Assistant Naval Constructor Hobson, United States Navy, and a volunteer crew sink the collier *Merrimac* at the entrance to the harbor of Santiago de Cuba in order to obstruct the channel at that point.
10. Battalion of United States marines lands at Guantanamo, Cuba.
14. Major-General Shafter sails from Tampa, Fla., with 10,887 officers and men for Santiago, Cuba.
15. Second expedition sails for Manila under command of Brig. Gen. F. V. Greene, U. S. V. This expedition comprised the First Colorado Volunteer Infantry, First Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, 4 companies Eighteenth and 4 companies Twenty-third United States Infantry, 2 battalions Utah Volunteer Artillery, and detachment of United States engineers.

1898.

- June 18. Aguinaldo, by proclamation, establishes an interior civil government at points captured from or abandoned by Spanish authority.
20. General Shafter's expeditionary forces arrive at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.
20. Third Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry leaves the United States for Porto Rico.
21. Formal surrender of the island of Guam, Ladrones group, to the commanding officer U. S. S. *Charleston*.
22. The *St. Paul*, off San Juan, P. R., commanded by Captain Sigbee, is engaged by the unprotected cruiser *Isabella II* and the destroyer *Terror*, resulting in the withdrawal of the Spanish cruiser and the sinking of the *Terror*.
22. General Shafter's expeditionary forces arrived at and began to disembark at Daiquiri and Siboney, Cuba.
22. A demonstration is made at Cabanas and Punta Gorda, defenses of Santiago.
23. Aguinaldo proclaims himself military dictator and president of the Philippine revolution and outlines a system of general government.
23. Thirty-third Michigan Volunteer Infantry leaves the United States for Cuba.
23. The occupation of Juragua City, Cuba, during the morning by American forces was reported.
24. The Fourteenth and Tenth Cavalry and Wood's regiment have a skirmish near Sevilla, the enemy driven from his position, and same occupied by the American troops.
24. A force consisting of 1 squadron First Cavalry, 1 Tenth Cavalry, and 2 of the First United States Volunteer Cavalry (Roosevelt's Rough Riders) engage Spanish force at Las Guasimas, Cuba, and drive them from the field, this being the first battle of the war with Spain.
26. Ninth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry leaves the United States for Cuba.
26. Admiral Camara's squadron, en route to Manila, arrives at the northern entrance of Suez Canal.
27. Third expedition sails for Manila under command of Maj. Gen. Wesley Merritt, U. S. A., and Brig. Gen. Arthur MacArthur, U. S. V. This expedition comprised 4 companies of the Twenty-third United States Infantry, 4 batteries of the Third United States Artillery, 1 company United States Engineers, First Idaho Volunteer Infantry, First Wyoming Volunteer Infantry, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, First North Dakota Volunteer Infantry, Astor Battery, and detachments Hospital and Signal Corps.
30. First expedition, under command Brig. Gen. T. M. Anderson, U. S. V., arrives off Manila.
30. U. S. S. *Hist* and *Hornet* engage and destroy Spanish gunboat, sloop loaded with soldiers and pontoon, Manzanillo, Cuba.
- July 1. Disembarkation of expeditionary forces begun and landing made at Cavite.
1. The Fifth Corps (Army) assault and carry San Juan and El Caney, defenses of the city of Santiago.
1. Engagement in the harbor of Manzanillo between Spanish gunboats and shore batteries and a portion of the United States squadron in those waters (*Oceola* and *Scorpion*).
1. First Illinois Volunteer Infantry leaves United States for Cuba.
1. Emilio Aguinaldo y Famy proclaims himself president of the Filipino republic.
3. Brigadier-General Randolph and 6 light batteries, on the *Comanche* and 2 English 9-knot transports, and the First District of Columbia Infantry, on the *Catania*, sail for Key West en route to Santiago to reinforce Major-General Shafter.
3. The *Maria Teresa*, the flagship of the Spanish fleet, appears at the entrance of Santiago Harbor at full speed, followed by the *Vizcaya*, *Cristobal Colon*, *Almirante Oquendo*, last of the last cruisers, and about thirty-five minutes later by the destroyers *Pluton* and *Furor*. The American fleet thwarts the attempt to escape, which ends in the complete demolition of the Spanish ships in forty-five minutes, with the exception of the *Colon*, which ran ashore at Rio Tarquino, 48 miles from Santiago, at 1.15 p. m.
4. General Pando, with 5,000 men, enters the city of Santiago during the night.
5. During the morning General Trol, commanding the Spanish forces in Santiago de Cuba, asks for further extension of truce in order that he may communicate with the Madrid Government concerning the surrender of the city, and requests that General Shafter send in some cable operators to work the cable between Santiago and Kingston. In reply, Major-General Shafter sends a message informing General Trol of the destruction of Cervera's fleet, repeating his demand for the surrender of the city, and permits the cable operators to go in for the purpose named, placing the time for the resumption of hostilities on Saturday, the 9th of July, 1898.
6. General Trol agrees to exchange Lieutenant Hobson and his 7 sailors for an equal number of Spanish prisoners. Exchange made, Lieutenant Arias of the Spanish army and 7 soldiers being turned over to the officer in charge of the Americans.
6. Eighth Ohio Volunteer Infantry leaves the United States for Cuba.
6. Joint resolution providing for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States adopted by the Senate by a vote of 42 to 21, and approved by President on following day.
6. The Spanish cruiser *Alfonso XII* leaves the harbor of Habana in an attempt to escape, but is discovered by the blockading squadron which gives chase. The cruiser stranded at the entrance of the port of Mariel, where it is finally destroyed by fire resulting from American shells.
6. General Trol, in command of the Spanish forces at Santiago, Cuba, asks and is granted sufficient time to consult his Government.
7. The Navy takes Isla Grande and garrison of 1,300 without resistance.
7. Act of Congress providing for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands approved by the President.
8. Sixth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry leaves the United States for Porto Rico.
8. Maj. Gen. Nelson A. Miles, commanding the Army, leaves Charleston, S. C., with reinforcements for General Shafter's force, investing Santiago de Cuba.
10. Hostilities are resumed, having failed to arrive at an agreement as to terms of surrender, and bombardment is continued on the 11th until a flag of truce is raised in the city of Santiago and negotiations resumed.
10. Sixth Illinois Volunteer Infantry leaves the United States for Porto Rico.
11. General Miles arrives off the harbor of Santiago de Cuba with reinforcements.
11. Yellow fever makes its appearance in military hospital at Siboney, and on the 12th of July that town is burned.

1898.
July 13. The President issues a proclamation, the first State paper ever issued from this Government containing authorization and instruction for the government of captured foreign territory. The same transmitted to the Secretary of War on the 18th and published in General Orders, No. 101, Adjutant-General's Office, on same day, to the Army.
13. Generals Miles, Shafter, and Wheeler meet General Toral, attended by Colonel Valasquez and Mr. Mason, British vice-consul at Santiago, and confer as to terms of surrender.
 14. General Toral agrees to surrender the city of Santiago.
 15. Fourth expedition sails for Manila under command of Maj. Gen. E. S. Otis, United States Volunteers. This expedition comprised 6 troops Fourth United States Cavalry, 2 batteries Sixth United States Artillery, 5 companies Fourteenth United States Infantry, and a detachment of recruits. One battalion of the First California Volunteer Infantry encamps at Malate, on the outskirts of the city of Manila.
 16. The terms of the surrender of the Spanish forces occupying the division of Santiago de Cuba are signed by both the Spanish and the American commissioners.
 17. Second expedition under command of Brig. Gen. F. V. Greene, United States Volunteers, arrives in the bay of Manila.
 17. Santiago de Cuba is formally surrendered.
 18. Engagement in the harbor of Manzanillo, Cuba, resulting in the destruction of several Spanish gunboats.
 19. Fifth expedition sails for Manila, with First Montana Volunteer Infantry and detachment of recruits, under command of Col. H. C. Kessler, First Montana Volunteers.
 20. Maj. Gen. James H. Wilson, United States Volunteers, sails with his division from Charleston, S. C., en route to Porto Rico.
 21. United States Navy takes possession of Bay of Nipe, Cuba, and destroys Spanish cruiser *Jorge Juan*.
 21. Gen. Nelson A. Miles sails with expedition for Porto Rico, conveyed by ships of the North Atlantic Squadron.
 22. Sixteenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry leaves the United States for Porto Rico.
 23. Sixth expedition sails for Manila with 8 companies of the First South Dakota Volunteer Infantry and detachments, under command of Brig. Gen. H. G. Otis, U. S. V.
 25. General Merritt arrives at Manila.
 25. Expedition under General Miles arrives during the morning off the harbor of Guanica, P. R. The blockhouse on the beach is taken and marines landed.
 26. General Wilson's division arrives off Guanica, P. R., during the night.
 26. Brigadier-General Garretson, in command of 6 companies of the Sixth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry and 1 company of the Sixth Illinois Volunteer Infantry, engage a force of Spanish troops at Yauco, P. R., and take possession of that place.
 27. Fourth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry leaves the United States for Porto Rico.
 27. Commander Davis, United States Navy, arrives in the harbor of Ponce, P. R., and demands the surrender of that city.
 27. Major-General Wilson arrives in the harbor of Guanica, P. R., with Ernst's Brigade.
 28. General Miles, with his expedition, leaves Guanica and arrives and disembarks at Ponce, P. R.
 28. Troops under command of Maj. Gen. John R. Brooke, United States Army, embark at Newport News, Va., en route for Porto Rico.
 28. The fleet and transports under command of General Wilson move into the harbor of the port of Ponce, P. R., disembark, and march to the city of Ponce and take formal possession of the city and the adjacent country.
 29. Seventh expedition sails for Manila with four companies of the First South Dakota Volunteer Infantry and detachment of recruits, under command of Lieut. Col. Lee Stover, First South Dakota Volunteers.
 30. An answer to Spain's inquiry concerning peace terms is handed to the French ambassador, M. Jules Cambon, setting forth the terms under which hostilities will be stopped.
 31. Third expedition, under command of Brig. Gen. Arthur MacArthur, arrives in the Bay of Manila.
 31. Night attack on United States forces by Spanish troops in trenches around the city of Manila.
 31. Maj. Gen. John R. Brooke arrives off the island of Porto Rico and is directed to disembark at Arroyo.
 31. Brig. Gen. Theodore Schwan, United States Volunteers, arrives at Guanica, P. R., with reinforcements for the expeditionary forces of General Miles.
- Aug. 1. Arroyo, P. R., formally surrenders to the United States Navy.
1. Second Division, Eighth Army Corps, organized under command of Brig. Gen. T. M. Anderson, and Brigadier-Generals MacArthur and Greene assigned to command brigades therein. During the night Spanish field artillery at Manila shells the trenches occupied by United States troops.
 2. The United States transport *Berlin*, with Hood's Second United States Volunteer Infantry, arrives at Santiago, Cuba.
 2. Spanish at Manila open fire at 5 a. m. and 9.45 p. m. on the trenches occupied by United States troops, continuing in each instance for a period of less than an hour.
 3. First Kentucky Volunteer Infantry leaves the United States for Porto Rico.
 4. Captain-General Don Basilio Augustin relieved as governor-general of the Philippine Islands by Don Fermin Jaudenes, second in command.
 5. Spanish at Manila open vigorous fire with artillery and infantry on the troops in trenches.
 5. Forces under Maj. Gen. John R. Brooke engage Spanish at Guayama, P. R., and capture that place.
 5. Light Batteries A and C, Pennsylvania Volunteer Artillery, leave the United States for Porto Rico.
 5. Sheridan's Troop and Governor's Troop, Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, leave the United States for Porto Rico.
 6. Four companies Second United States Volunteer Engineers leave the United States for Hawaiian Islands.
 7. Joint demand made by General Merritt and Admiral Dewey on the captain-general for the removal of noncombatants from the city of Manila, and notice given of intention to bombard the city. Camp Dewey established on the outskirts of the city.
 9. In reply to statement of inability on part of Spanish authorities to remove noncombatants from city on account of the presence of insurgent troops, joint formal demand is made for the surrender of the city of Manila and its defenses.
 9. Foreign war vessels leave their anchorage in front of city, and American fleet clears for action.

1898.
Aug. 9. A sharp engagement at Los Banos, Coamo, and Aibonito, P. R., results in the defeat of the Spanish and the occupation of those places by the United States forces.
9. General Schwan's command advances from Yauco, P. R., westward and successively occupies the towns of Sabana Grande, San German, Lajas, and Cabo Royo.
 10. General Merritt and Admiral Dewey jointly decline to allow the Governor-General of the Philippines sufficient time to consult his Government before attacking the city of Manila.
 10. United States forces advancing on Mayaguez, P. R., defeat the Spanish forces in a series of engagements.
 10. First United States Volunteer Engineers leaves the United States for Porto Rico.
 11. The Department of Santiago, with Maj. Gen. Henry W. Lawton assigned as commander, with headquarters in the city of Santiago, Cuba, is established by direction of the President.
 11. United States forces enter the city of Mayaguez, P. R.
 12. Protocol with Spain signed at Washington, D. C., by Hon. William Day, Secretary of State, and M. Jules Cambon, French ambassador to the United States.
 12. The Hawaiian legislature having ratified the action of the United States providing for the annexation of the islands, Admiral Miller, United States Navy, with a force of marines, takes formal possession.
 12. The bombardment of the Cuban town of Manzanillo by the U. S. cruiser *Newark*, commanded by Captain Goodrich, supported by the *Swansea*, *Oswego*, *Hist*, and converted Spanish gunboat *Alcedo*, is begun at 3.45 p. m. and is continued until night. On succeeding morning two Spanish officers, in a small boat and under a flag of truce, announce that the peace protocol has been signed.
 13. The United States forces defeat the Spanish in an engagement at Las Marias, P. R.
 13. Spanish intrenchments about the city of Manila bombarded by the Navy and stormed and carried by the troops; the city entered and a commission appointed to draw articles of capitulation.
 13. Third United States Volunteer Infantry leaves the United States for Cuba.
 13. A demand is made for the surrender of San Juan, P. R., which is refused.
 14. General Merritt issues his first proclamation to the Filipino people.
 15. By General Orders, No. 4, paragraph 2, Headquarters Department of the Pacific and Eighth Army Corps, Manila, P. I., the office of provost-marshal-general is established, and Brig. Gen. Arthur MacArthur, United States Volunteers, is appointed military governor of the walled city of Manila and provost-marshal-general of the city of Manila, including all the outlying districts within the municipal jurisdiction.
 15. Orders issued for the assumption of civil government by the United States military authorities in the city of Manila and district of Cavite and officers assigned to duty thereunder.
 16. By General Orders, No. 4, Headquarters Department of the Pacific and Eighth Army Corps, Lieut. Col. C. A. Whittier, United States Volunteers, is assigned to duty as collector of the port of Manila, P. I., the first to be appointed.
 16. General Merritt receives cablegram from the President announcing cessation of hostilities.
 17. The *Yale*, containing medical supplies, arrives at Santiago, Cuba.
 17. The transport *Berlin* sails from New Orleans, La., for Santiago, Cuba, with the Ninth United States Volunteers.
 18. President forbids joint occupation of the city of Manila with insurgents.
 21. Transport *Arizona* sails for Manila with 4 companies of the Eighteenth United States Infantry and detachments First Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and First Colorado Volunteer Infantry, under command of Brig. Gen. Charles King, U. S. V.
 21. Second Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry leaves Cuba for the United States.
 22. Disembarkation of Light Battery D, Sixth Artillery, headquarters and 5 companies Fourteenth United States Infantry, detachments of Twenty-third United States Infantry, Third Artillery, First California, First Wyoming, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and 2 batteries Utah Volunteer Light Artillery, from transports *Peru*, *City of Puebla*, and *City of Rio de Janeiro*, begins at Manila.
 22. Military commissions and provost courts for the city of Manila provided for and their jurisdiction defined.
 23. Gen. E. S. Otis announced in orders as the commanding general, Eighth Army Corps.
 24. First South Dakota Volunteer Infantry, First Montana Volunteer Infantry, and detachment Volunteer Signal Corps arrive in Philippine Islands.
 25. Twenty-third Kansas Volunteer Infantry (colored) leaves United States for Cuba.
 25. First Division Eighth Army Corps organized, Brig. Gen. T. M. Anderson, commanding.
 28. General Merritt assumes duties as military governor and transfers command of the Eighth Army Corps to Maj. Gen. E. S. Otis, U. S. V.
 28. Brig. Gen. Arthur MacArthur relieves General Anderson in command of Second Division.
 28. Disembarkation of Light Battery, Sixth United States Artillery, 6 troops Fourth United States Cavalry, First Montana, and First South Dakota Volunteer Infantry from transports *Peru*, *Pennsylvania*, and *City of Rio de Janeiro* begins at Cavite.
 29. Maj. Gen. E. S. Otis, U. S. V., relieves Maj. Gen. Wesley Merritt, U. S. A., in command of the Department of the Pacific and as military governor of the Philippine Islands.
 30. Brig. Gen. H. G. Otis, U. S. V., assigned to command of First Brigade, First Division.
- Sept. 2. First Battalion First South Dakota Volunteer Infantry disembarks at Manila.
8. General Otis demands the withdrawal of insurgent forces from the entire city of Manila, its suburbs, and defenses.
 13. Commission appointed by Aguinaldo confers with General Otis in regard to his demand for the withdrawal of insurgent forces from the city of Manila.
 15. Insurgents withdraw from limits of the city of Manila as established by General Otis, with the exception of the districts of Paco and Pandacan, south of the Pasig River.
- Oct. 7. Civil courts as constituted by the laws of Spain are allowed to resume their jurisdiction and regular functions, subject to supervision of the military government in its policy of occupation.

- 1898.
- Oct. 7. By General Orders, No. 163, Adjutant-General's Office, the Secretary of War directs that the Third, Fifth, and Sixth Army Corps be discontinued, and that the First, Second, and Fourth Army Corps be reorganized and assigned to camps as thereafter specified.
9. General Anderson and staff, while proceeding up the Pasig River in a steam launch, are ordered to return to the city by a Filipino guard.
10. General Otis makes formal demand for the retirement of Filipino forces from Paco, Pandacan, and other points established by survey to be within the city limits.
14. Eighth Army Corps reorganized.
16. Last detachment of Spanish troops depart from San Juan and thus formally terminate Spanish occupation of the Island of Porto Rico.
17. Battery D, California Volunteer Artillery, leaves United States for Philippine Islands.
17. Transport *Senator* sails for Manila with a battalion of Twenty-third United States Infantry, battery of California Volunteer Artillery, and detachment of recruits for Second Oregon Volunteer Infantry, under command of Maj. G. A. Goodale, Twenty-third United States Infantry.
19. Transport *Valencia* sails for Manila with Companies F, G, I, and L, First Washington Volunteer Infantry, and detachment of battalion California Artillery, under command of Lieut. Col. W. J. Fife, First Washington Volunteer Infantry.
20. Aguinaldo issues an order prohibiting all foreigners from entering the insurgent lines without passes and from approaching any of their earthworks or other defenses.
25. On demand of General Otis, of the 14th instant, insurgent troops are withdrawn from Paco and Pandacan, Manila, P. I., suburbs of Manila and defenses.
27. Transport *Indiana* sails for Manila with headquarters and band, Companies C, D, E, G, H, I, K, and M, Twentieth Kansas Volunteer Infantry, under command of Col. F. Funston, Twentieth Kansas Volunteer Infantry.
28. Transport *Ohio* sails for Manila with Companies A, B, C, D, E, H, K, and M, First Washington Volunteer Infantry, and detachment California Artillery, under command of Col. J. H. Wholley, First Washington Volunteer Infantry.
30. Transport *Zealandia* sails for Manila with the headquarters, Companies A, B, C, E, F, L, and M, First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, under command of Col. W. C. Smith, First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry.
- Nov. 3. Transport *Pennsylvania* sails for Manila with the Fifty-first Iowa Volunteer Infantry, under command of Col. J. C. Loper, Fifty-first Iowa Volunteer Infantry.
6. Transport *City of Puebla* sails for Manila with Companies D, G, H, I, and K, First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, detachment California Artillery, and First Troop Nevada Volunteer Cavalry, under command of Lieut. Col. Gracey Childers, First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry.
9. Transport *Newport* sails for Manila with Companies A, B, F, and L, Twentieth Kansas, and Wyoming Battery, under command of Brig. Gen. M. P. Miller, U. S. V.
10. Transport *Arizona* sails from Honolulu, H. I., for Manila, with battalion of Eighteenth United States Infantry, recruits for First Nebraska, Tenth Pennsylvania, and First Colorado Volunteer Infantry, and a detachment of Hospital Corps men.
21. Expedition under command of Maj. G. A. Goodale, Twenty-third United States Infantry, arrives at Manila. Left San Francisco October 17, 1898.
22. Expedition under command of Lieut. Col. W. J. Fife, First Washington Volunteer Infantry, which left San Francisco October 19, 1898, arrives at Manila.
24. Expedition under command of Maj. G. A. Goodale, Twenty-third United States Infantry, disembarks. Arrived at Manila November 21, 1898.
24. Expedition under command of Lieut. Col. W. J. Fife, First Washington Volunteer Infantry, which arrived November 22, 1898, disembarks.
24. Spanish troops evacuate Porto Principe and United States flag is raised.
25. Transport *Arizona* arrives at Manila from Honolulu with battalion of Eighteenth United States Infantry and detachment of recruits and Hospital Corps men. Sailed November 10, 1898.
26. Expedition under command of Col. J. H. Holley, First Washington Volunteer Infantry, which left San Francisco October 23, 1898, arrives at Manila.
26. Detachment of California Heavy Artillery disembarks at Manila.
28. Expedition under command of Col. W. C. Smith, First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, which left San Francisco October 30, 1898, arrives at Manila.
28. The Spanish commissioners at Paris formally agree to the construction of the protocol put upon it by the Americans, accepting the twenty millions of bonus. By the agreement Porto Rico, Philippine Islands (including the Sulu Archipelago), Guam, in the Ladrones Islands, are ceded to the United States; Spanish sovereignty of Cuba is relinquished unconditionally, and the United States agree to relinquish all claim for money indemnity for cost of war.
28. The United States transport *Zealandia* arrives at Manila, P. I., with Companies A, B, C, E, F, L, and M of the First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry.
30. Expedition under command of Col. F. Funston, Twentieth Kansas Volunteer Infantry, arrives at Manila; left San Francisco October 27, 1898.
30. Troops on transport *Arizona* arrived November 25; disembark and join regiments.
30. Companies A and B, Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, assigned to duty at Corregidor Island.
- Dec. 5. Troops of First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, arriving on transport *Zealandia* November 28, 1898, disembark and are assigned to duty with the provost guard.
6. Expedition under command of Lieut. Col. Gracey Childers, First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, arrives at Manila; left San Francisco November 6, 1898.
6. First Washington Volunteer Infantry disembarks from transports *Valencia* and *Ohio*.
7. Expeditions under command of Brig. Gen. M. P. Miller and Col. J. C. Loper, which sailed from San Francisco November 9 and 3, respectively, arrive at Manila.
7. The Two hundred and second New York Volunteer Infantry arrive in Cuba.
7. Troops of Twentieth Kansas Volunteer Infantry, on transport *Indiana*, which arrived November 30, 1898, disembark.
10. Treaty of peace signed at Paris between the United States and Spain.
- 1898.
- Dec. 10. Light Battery, Wyoming Volunteer Artillery, and Troop A, Nevada Cavalry, disembark from transports *Newport* and *City of Puebla*, respectively, and join garrison at Cavite.
11. Battalion of Twentieth Kansas Volunteer Infantry, arriving on transport *Newport* December 7, 1898, disembark and join regiment.
11. Detachment of California Heavy Artillery disembarks from transport *City of Puebla* and joins garrison at Cavite.
13. General Otis receives a petition signed by business men and firms at Iloilo asking for American occupation and protection.
13. Troops of First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, arriving on transport *City of Puebla* December 6, 1898, disembark and join regiment on provost duty.
13. One hundred and sixty-first Indiana Volunteer Infantry leaves the United States for Cuba.
17. General Otis grants authority to Spanish military authorities to discharge and return to their homes native troops in the employ of Spain.
19. Fourth Virginia Volunteer Infantry, excepting Company F, which sailed on the 13th, and Forty-ninth Iowa Volunteer Infantry leave the United States for Cuba.
20. Companies D, I, L, and M, Third United States Volunteer Engineers, leave United States for Cuba.
21. Sixth Missouri Volunteer Infantry leaves the United States for Cuba.
21. General Rios, Spanish army, receives instructions from Madrid to evacuate Iloilo.
23. First Texas Volunteer Infantry leaves the United States for Cuba.
23. President orders the relief of the Spanish garrison at Iloilo by United States forces.
24. Spanish garrison at Iloilo evacuate the city and insurgents take possession.
24. First separate brigade organized under command of Brig. Gen. M. P. Miller and ordered to proceed to Iloilo.
26. Expedition sails for Iloilo from Manila.
28. Expeditionary forces arrive in harbor at Iloilo and open communication with the insurgents in possession of the city, with a view to its occupation by United States forces.
28. The President issues a proclamation for publication in the Philippines relative to the administration of affairs in those islands.
29. Insurgents ask for time to receive instructions from revolutionary government as to the occupation of Iloilo.
30. Insurgent leaders at Iloilo refuse consent to the landing of United States troops at that place.
30. Sixth Ohio Volunteer Infantry and Twelfth New York Volunteer Infantry leave the United States for Cuba.
- 1899.
- Jan. 1. Relinquishment of Spanish sovereignty in Cuba is formally made to United States Evacuation Commission.
1. General Miller transmits to insurgent leader substance of the President's proclamation to the people of the Philippines.
3. Second South Carolina Volunteer Infantry, Ninth Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Fourth Illinois Volunteer Infantry leave United States for Cuba.
4. The President transmits to the Senate the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain, together with the protocols and papers relating thereto.
5. Aguinaldo issues a proclamation intended to offset that of the President issued the day before.
7. Eighth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry leaves United States for Cuba.
8. One hundred and sixtieth Indiana Volunteer Infantry leaves United States for Cuba.
9. Aguinaldo appoints a commission to confer with commission of the United States concerning the situation of affairs in and around Manila.
14. Third Georgia Volunteer Infantry leaves United States for Cuba.
17. Battalions A, B, C, and D, Maine Volunteer Artillery, leave United States for Cuba.
18. Third Kentucky Volunteer Infantry leaves United States for Cuba.
19. Transport *Grant* sails from New York for Manila with the Fourth United States Infantry and Companies B, G, I, and M, Seventeenth United States Infantry, under command of Maj. Gen. H. W. Lawton, U. S. V.
22. Company I, First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, under command of Captain Givens, escorts a battalion of Spanish prisoners to the southern islands of the archipelago.
24. General Orders, No. 17, Adjutant-General's Office, organizes the military departments of Pinar del Rio, Brig. Gen. George W. Davis commanding; Province of Habana, Maj. Gen. Fitzhugh Lee commanding; Habana, Maj. Gen. William Ludlow commanding; Jatanzas, Maj. Gen. James H. Wilson commanding; Santa Clara, Maj. Gen. John C. Bates commanding; Puerto Principe, Brig. Gen. Louis H. Carpenter commanding; Santiago, Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood commanding.
25. United States and Filipino commissioners hold their first session at the city of Manila.
26. Transports *Scandia* and *Morgan City* sail for Manila with Twentieth United States Infantry, under command of Brig. Gen. Loyd Wheaton, U. S. V.
27. Thirty-first Michigan Volunteer Infantry leaves the United States for Cuba.
29. Expedition under command of Capt. N. N. Givens, which left Manila January 22, 1899, on escort duty, returns to station. Fifty-first Iowa Volunteer Infantry leaves Iloilo for Cavite, in order that troops may land for exercise.
- Feb. 1. Transports *Senator* and *Ohio* sail for Manila with the Twenty-second United States Infantry, under command of Col. H. C. Egbert, Twenty-second United States Infantry.
2. A strong detachment of insurgents advances toward the outpost of the United States troops, Manila, P. I., to draw their fire and take up a position immediately in front and within a few yards of same, where it remained all night.
3. Transport *Sherman* sails from New York for Manila with Third United States Infantry, and Companies D, H, K, and L, Seventeenth United States Infantry, under command of Col. J. H. Page, Third United States Infantry.
4. Four native scouts of the Filipino forces surrounding Manila, P. I., by repeatedly disregarding the agreement concerning the neutral zone between the American and Filipino troops, provoke a fire from the Nebraska sentries, resulting in the death of one of the scouts and the wounding of another and a general engagement, the first of the war, with the natives of the Philippines.
4. Companies E, F, G, and H, Third United States Volunteer Engineers, leave United States for Cuba.
4. Emilio Aguinaldo, of the insurgent forces, issues a proclamation declaring war to exist with the United States.

1899.

- Feb. 5. Advance made against insurgent lines results in their retreat to positions beyond the foothills and the capture of Santa Ana, San Pedro Macati, Pasig, and other villages in the immediate vicinity of the city of Manila.
5. Provost patrol disperses a party of armed natives within the city of Manila.
5. The towns of Guadalupe and San Perillo occupied by the Americans.
6. By the departure of the last detachments of Spanish troops from Cienfuegos the formal and complete evacuation of the island of Cuba by the Spanish army is effected. Earthworks and blockhouses constructed and occupied by insurgents and the city waterworks, on the Mariquina River east of Deposito, captured. General Otis requests permission to force the occupation of the city of Iloilo. Sharp and decisive skirmishes on the Mariquina road, near Manila. General Miller directed to take the city of Iloilo. First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry sails from Manila, P. I., for Iloilo, island of Panay, P. I.
9. Insurgent forces evacuate and fire San Roque, P. I., which is occupied by United States forces.
10. A general advance is made on the enemy's position in and about Calocan.
10. First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry arrives in the harbor of Iloilo.
10. General Miller calls on the insurgents for the surrender of the city of Iloilo and notifies foreign consulates to remove noncombatants from the city.
11. City of Iloilo is fired and abandoned by the insurgents, being immediately occupied by the United States forces. During the afternoon an exchange of shots occurs between the insurgents in the suburbs of Malabon, P. I., and the Utah battery behind an earthwork commanding the approach to that town.
12. The insurgents make a spirited attack on the outpost at Mariquina, P. I., and are defeated and driven several miles northward through San Francisco del Monte toward Calocan. Line of First Separate Brigade extended toward Jaro and Molo, driving the insurgents before it.
13. Eighteenth United States Infantry encounters insurgents at the main bridge over the Jaro River.
14. A detachment of 500 insurgents is defeated in the vicinity of Santa Barbara.
15. United States troops occupy Molo. The provost-marshal-general, city of Manila, secures possession of an order of the so-called Malalos government directed to insurgents of the city of Manila ordering an uprising.
17. Companies A, B, C, and K, Third United States Volunteer Engineers leave United States for Cuba.
18. Guadalupe, P. I., evacuated by the American troops.
19. United States troops occupy Aravelo, P. I. Transport *Sheridan* sails from New York for Manila with the Twelfth United States Infantry and headquarters and Companies A, C, E, and F, Seventh United States Infantry. A reconnaissance to Oton, P. I., from Iloilo is made by a battalion of the First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry.
20. A reconnaissance is made on the opposite side of the Pasig River, from San Pedro Macati, resulting in the location and defeat of the company of insurgents that had been supplying the patrols which had been annoying outposts in the vicinity of Mandalayan. East Paco is fired by incendiaries. Demonstration by insurgents between Mariquina and Calinta, P. I.
22. Incendiary fires occur in the city of Manila. The insurgents south of Waterworks road, near Manila, P. I., are attacked and driven off.
23. The insurgents in the vicinity of San Francisco del Monte are shelled by one Utah gun, with the assistance of infantry, and repulsed. Insurgent outbreak in the Tondo district of Manila. Tenth Pennsylvania and First South Dakota Volunteer Infantry engage the insurgents. Twentieth United States Infantry arrives at Manila and is assigned to provost duty in the city. Provost guard suppresses outbreak in the city of Manila.
24. First Nebraska Volunteer Infantry defeats a party of insurgents north of the Mariquina road.
25. Minor engagement in the vicinity of Mandurriao, in which insurgents are driven off.
28. Companies A, I, K, M, Twenty-third United States Infantry, arrive at Cebu, island of Cebu, P. I.
- Mar. 1. Insurgents make an attack in force on outposts of First and Second Battalions, Eighteenth United States Infantry, at Iloilo, island of Panay. Insurgents shelled from trenches by Battery G, Sixth United States Artillery, and attacked and routed by the Eighteenth United States Infantry. Visayan military district established. Cebu, island of Cebu, occupied without resistance.
2. Congress authorizes enlistment of 35,000 volunteers and increase of the Regular Army to 65,000 men.
3. Tennessee Volunteer Infantry and Light Battery G, Sixth United States Artillery, make a reconnaissance on the Savanna, south-east of La Paz.
4. Transport *Senator*, with portion of Twenty-second United States Infantry, which sailed from San Francisco February 1, 1899, arrives at Manila.
5. Transport *Ohio*, with portion of the Twenty-second United States Infantry, which sailed from San Francisco February 1, 1899, arrives at Manila. Insurgents entrenched across Mariquina road, northeast of Deposito, are routed and driven off. Cable communication with Iloilo established. Two members of an insurgent peace commission arrive at Manila, P. I.
- First Nebraska Volunteer Infantry engages the enemy on the north and south of pumping station on the Mariquina road, driving them off.
7. Entire district lying between the Pasig River, the Mariquina River, and the Deposito pumping station road is cleared of insurgent forces.
8. The Twelfth United States Infantry, en route to Manila, lands at Malta, and is received with courtesies by the British garrison at that point.
10. Expedition under command of Maj. Gen. H. W. Lawton, which sailed from New York City, via Suez Canal, arrives at Manila.
11. A provisional brigade for temporary service, composed of the Twentieth and Twenty-second United States Infantry; Companies C, D, E, G, H, K, L, and M, First Washington Volunteer Infantry; Companies A, B, D, E, I, L, and M, Second Oregon Volunteer Infantry; Troops E, I, and K, Fourth United States Cavalry, and one section of Light Battery D, Sixth United States Artillery, under command of Maj. Gen. H. W. Lawton, engage the insurgents at Guadalupe, Pasig, Fateros, and Cayenta, March 11 to 17.
13. Engagements at Guadalupe and Pasig Ferry.

XXXIV—8

1899.

- Mar. 14. United States forces storm and capture insurgent defenses at Fateros, P. I.
16. First Separate Brigade engages the insurgents at Jaro Bridge and Mandarinao. Two companies of the First Colorado Volunteer Infantry attack body of insurgents retreating from Canita and drive them through the town of Mariquina.
17. Gen. H. W. Lawton relieves Gen. T. M. Anderson in command of the First Division.
21. Companies F, G, L, and M, First California Volunteer Infantry, sail from Manila en route to Bacolod, island of Negros.
22. Expedition under command of Col. J. H. Page, Third United States Infantry, sailed from New York City February 3, 1899, via Suez Canal, arrives at Manila.
24. Transport *City of Puebla* sails for Manila with headquarters and Companies A, F, G, I, L, and M, Ninth United States Infantry, under command of Capt. James Regan, Ninth United States Infantry.
25. General engagement at Calocan, participated in by Twenty-second United States Infantry, Second Oregon Volunteer Infantry, and the Second Battalion, Third United States Infantry; enemy driven across the river in front of Malinto.
26. Second Oregon Volunteer Infantry cross the Talishan River east of Malabon and drive the insurgents by successive charges from trenches occupied by them along the line of road leading to Balacoon; Twenty-second United States Infantry captures Malinto under heavy insurgent fire.
27. Brig. Gen. M. P. Miller retires and is succeeded in command of the Visayan military district by Colonel Van Valzah, U. S. A.; engagements at Maricao and Maricao Bridge; headquarters and Companies F, G, I, L, and M, First California Volunteer Infantry, arrive at Bacolod, island of Negros, P. I.
28. Transport *Zealandia* sails for Manila with 6 companies of the Ninth United States Infantry, under command of Capt. C. M. Rockfeller, Ninth United States Infantry; massacre of friendly natives by insurgents at Labjid, island of Negros.
29. Engagements at Bocaue Bridge, Bigaa, and Guiguinto, P. I.
31. The insurgent capital at Malalos stormed and occupied by United States troops; battalion Twenty-third Infantry engages insurgents about 4 miles from Mariquina.
- Apr. 8. Expedition comprising Troops C, G, and L, Fourth Cavalry; Companies A, C, D, E, G, I, K, and L, Fourteenth United States Infantry; Companies A, C, D, and F, First Idaho Volunteer Infantry; Companies C, D, I, and K, First North Dakota Volunteer Infantry; 2 mountain guns from the separate mountain-gun battery, and 4 companies of sharpshooters concentrate at San Pedro Macati and embark on cascos up the Pasig River for Laguna de Bay.
9. Attack on and occupation of the city of Santa Cruz by the Laguna de Bay expedition.
10. Towns of Pagsayjan, Longos, and Paete occupied by the expeditionary forces.
12. Treaty of peace with Spain signed by the President. The town of Longos is occupied by United States forces without resistance. A reconnaissance from Longos to Paete meets with strong opposition from the insurgents, who are defeated, and the town of Paete is occupied.
13. Outposts at Malalos attacked by insurgents, who are driven off.
14. Expedition under command of Lieut. Col. J. H. Smith, Twelfth United States Infantry, which sailed from New York via Suez Canal February 19, 1899, arrives at Manila.
15. Engagement with insurgents near Quingua.
17. Expeditionary forces return to San Pedro Macati.
18. Transport *Hancock* sails for Manila with Twenty-first United States Infantry and Light Battery E, First United States Artillery, under command of Col. J. Kline, Twenty-first United States Infantry.
20. Transport *Newport* sails for Manila with Light Battery F, Fourth, and Light Battery F, Fifth United States Artillery, under command of Maj. J. L. Tiernon, First United States Artillery. Transport *Warren* sails for Manila with headquarters and 3 batteries of the Sixth United States Artillery and detachment of recruits, under command of Brig. Gen. E. B. Williston. Insurgent forces repulsed in the vicinity of Taguig.
21. First North Dakota Volunteer Infantry; Twenty-second United States Infantry; Companies A, C, E, G, H, K, L, and M, Third United States Infantry; Troops C, G, and L, Fourth United States Cavalry; Hawthorne's Separate Mountain Battery; Second Platoon, Light Artillery D, Sixth United States Artillery; section Utah Light Artillery, and detachment Nineteenth Company Volunteer Signal Corps concentrate at La Loma Church and move northward.
22. Troops of the northern expedition successfully assault and occupy the city of Novaliches. A column of the northern expedition, under the command of Col. Owen Summers, Second Oregon Volunteer Infantry, is assembled at Bocaue Bridge, P. I.
23. Colonel Summers's column of the northern expedition leave Bocaue and marches to Norzagaray, meeting but slight resistance. Expedition under command of Capt. James Regan, Ninth United States Infantry, which sailed from San Francisco March 24, 1899, arrives at Manila.
24. San Jose occupied by the main column of the northern expedition and the city of Norzagaray is assaulted and captured by the Bocaue column of the expedition. Troops of the Second Division force passage of the Quingua River and advance on Pulilan.
25. The main column of the northern expedition joins the Bocaue column at Norzagaray. Troops of the Second Division advance along the north bank of the Quingua River toward Calumpit, where they ford the Calumpit River and clear the town of insurgents. First Montana Volunteer Infantry and Twentieth Kansas Volunteer Infantry move against insurgents on the Bag Bag River and capture their position on the banks of that river. Insurgents are driven from their position at Angat.
26. The northern expedition encamps at Angat and Marunco.
27. Expedition under command of Capt. C. M. Rockfeller, Ninth United States Infantry, which sailed from San Francisco March 28, 1899, arrive at Manila.
28. Transport *Ohio* sails for Manila with 6 companies of Thirteenth United States Infantry under command of Capt. J. H. H. Peshine, Thirteenth United States Infantry. *Senator* sails for Manila with headquarters and 6 companies Thirteenth United States Infantry under command of Col. A. T. Smith, Thirteenth United States Infantry. Troops of the Second Division force passage of the Calumpit River and defeat the insurgent forces under the personal command of General Luna. A reconnoitering party encounters a band of 300 insurgents near Angat, P. I.
29. The northern expedition moves along both banks of the Rio Grande de la Bulacan, after engaging the enemy and driving them down the river, take the town of San Rafael and then returns to Angat.

- 1890.
- May 2. Gen. Gregorio del Pilar's division of insurgent troops is defeated and the important cities of Balinag and Bustos are occupied by United States forces. Scouts of northern expedition dislodge a strong force of insurgents near San Felipe, P. I.
3. A detachment of scouts defeats an insurgent body on the San Miguel road. Brig. Gen. J. F. Smith assumes command of the Visayan military district.
4. A brigade of the northern expedition engages the insurgents near Maasin and occupies that town. Sharp engagement at the Santo Tomas River.
5. Capt. George H. Tilly, United States Volunteer Signal Corps, killed by natives at Escalante Bay, Philippine Islands, who are pursued in the mountains, where some are killed and their village destroyed.
7. River gunboats, under command of Captain Grant, Utah Volunteer Artillery, shell insurgents from their trenches along the Guagua River.
10. Gunboats engage the insurgents at San Luis.
11. Insurgents driven out of San Yldefonso. The U. S. transport *Hancock* arrives at Manila, P. I., having on board the Twenty-first United States Infantry and Light Battery E, First United States Artillery.
13. Commissioners from the insurgents ask for conference with General Lawton at Baliuag. Northern expedition takes the city of San Miguel de Mayumo.
15. General Lawton routs the enemy near San Isidro and marches from thence on San Miguel. Engagement at San Jose, P. I.
17. San Isidro, the third city occupied by the insurgents as a capital, is captured by the forces under General Lawton. The town of Capan, P. I., is entered without opposition. United States troops occupy Candaba, P. I. Headquarters and Companies B, C, D, E, F, G, H, L, Twenty-third United States Infantry, sail from Manila, P. I., for Jolo, Island of Jolo, P. I. Aguinaldo and his revolutionary government retire to Cabanatuan.
18. Headquarters and Batteries B, C, E, F, H, L, M, O, Sixth United States Artillery, arrive at Manila, P. I.
19. United States forces occupy Cabaio, P. I. Spanish garrison at Jolo relieved by United States troops.
21. United States forces occupy the town of Arayat, P. I., without incident.
22. Transport *Sherman* sails for Manila with Sixth United States Infantry and recruits, under command of Brig. Gen. J. C. Bates. United States forces occupy Candaba, P. I.
23. United States forces en route from San Miguel to Baliuag engage insurgents near San Yldefonso.
24. Insurgents engaged in harassing outposts at San Fernando are driven off with heavy loss.
27. Northern expedition returns to Manila.
30. Transport *Grant* sails for Manila with Sixteenth United States Infantry and recruits under command of Lieut. Col. W. F. Spurgin. Sixteenth United States Infantry. A detachment Twenty-third United States Infantry engages and defeats outlaw band on the island of Negros.
- June 3. United States forces capture Cainta, P. I. The bureau of inspection is established in the city of Manila, P. I., under the jurisdiction of the provost-marshal general. Advance is made upon Antipolo, P. I., against insurgent forces under General Pilar.
4. United States forces occupy Teresa, P. I. Brig. Gen. R. P. Hughes assumes command of the Visayan military district. United States forces occupy Antipolo, P. I., which had been evacuated by insurgents a few hours before.
5. Morong occupied by United States troops after a decisive engagement. Courts of first instance and courts of peace are established in the city and province of Manila.
10. Generals Owenshine and Wheaton's columns defeat insurgents at Paranaque and Los Pinas.
13. Insurgents intrenched along the Zapote in the vicinity of Los Pinas are defeated with considerable loss. Engagement at the Zapote River, P. I.
14. Battalion First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry arrives at Cebu, P. I. Transports *Ohio* and *Senator* sail from Manila with Second Oregon Volunteer Infantry under command of Col. Owen Summers.
15. Imus voluntarily surrenders to General Lawton and invites occupation of the city by his command.
16. Town of San Nicolas occupied by United States troops. Demonstration made against San Fernando by the insurgents.
19. Insurgents ambush reconnoitering party on the Dasmariñas rode and are routed by the main column.
22. Transport *Zealandia* sails for Manila with Companies C, E, G, and I, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry, under command of Maj. J. M. Thompson, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry.
24. Transport *Sheridan* sails for Manila with Troops A and F, Fourth United States Cavalry, Companies B and H, Fourteenth United States Infantry, and detachment of recruits, under command of Brig. Gen. S. B. M. Young.
26. Town of El Pardo occupied by United States troops. Sixth United States Infantry sails from Manila, P. I., for Negros, island of Negros, P. I.
28. Transport *Valencia* sails for Manila with headquarters and Troops B and M, Fourth United States Cavalry, and Companies E and H, Twenty-fifth United States Infantry, under command of Maj. Charles Morton, Fourth United States Cavalry.
- July 1. Transport *Pennsylvania* sails for Manila with headquarters and six companies Twenty-fifth United States Infantry, under command of Col. A. S. Burt, Twenty-fifth United States Infantry. Transport *Hancock* sails from Manila with First Nebraska Volunteer Infantry and Batteries A and B, Utah Volunteer Artillery, under command of Col. H. B. Mulford. Transport *Senator* sails from Manila with Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry under command of Lieut. Col. J. E. Barnett. Mayors for the cities of Paranaque, Los Pinas, Bacoor, and Imus elected by natives under military protection. Engagement with bandits, island of Negros.
2. Transport *Sherman* arrives at Bacolor with Sixth United States Infantry.
5. The President authorizes organization of 10 volunteer regiments under act of March 2, 1899 (Twenty-sixth to Thirty-fifth, inclusive).
11. Transport *Conemaugh* sails for Manila with detachment of Fourth United States Cavalry and 275 horses under command of First Lieut. E. B. Winans, jr., Fourth United States Cavalry.
13. Transport *City of Para* sails for Manila with Troops D and H, Fourth United States Cavalry, headquarters and Companies A, F, H, and K, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry, and Company B, Engineer Battalion, under command of Brig. Gen. Theodore Schwan, U. S. V.
- 1899.
- July 17. Transport *Warren* sails for Manila with First Colorado Volunteer Infantry under command of Col. H. B. McCoy.
18. President authorizes organization of 2 additional regiments of volunteers (Thirty-sixth and Thirty-seventh), to be recruited in the Philippine Islands.
19. Lieutenant Evans, Sixth United States Infantry, with 35 men, attacks the enemy near Canloan, P. I., kills 3, and captures many stores. Capt. B. A. Byrne and Lieutenant Nesbitt, with a force of 70 men, surprise a superior force of the enemy, and in a hand-to-hand engagement kill 150 insurgents, with a loss of 1 killed and wounded. Detachment of Sixth United States Infantry defeats a robber band near Tolon.
22. Civil government established at Negros.
24. Company K, Twenty-third Infantry, defeats insurgents in the Acan Valley, Cebu.
25. Transport *Tartar* sails for Manila with headquarters and Companies B, D, F, G, H, I, K, and M, Nineteenth United States Infantry, under command of Col. S. Snyder, Nineteenth United States Infantry.
26. Transport *Ohio* sails for Manila with two companies Nineteenth United States Infantry and detachment of recruits under command of Maj. O. J. Sweet, Twenty-third United States Infantry. Transport *Newport* sails for Manila with two companies Nineteenth United States Infantry and detachment of recruits under command of Capt. F. H. French, Nineteenth United States Infantry. Transport *Tacoma* sails for Manila with detachment of Fourth United States Cavalry and 200 horses under command of Capt. G. O. Cress, Fourth United States Cavalry. Transport *Sheridan* sails from Manila with First California Volunteer Infantry and Batteries A and D, California Volunteer Light Artillery, under command of Col. V. D. Duboce. Calamba captured after a sharp skirmish.
28. Captain Simpson, Sixth Infantry, with 67 men of Company E, in a short engagement with enemy near Valdez, kills 18 and takes 1 prisoner.
29. Company L, Twenty-third Infantry, takes station at Kolo, P. I.
31. Transport *Grant* sails from Manila with First Wyoming Volunteer Infantry, First Dakota (North) Volunteer Infantry, First Idaho Volunteer Infantry, and Wyoming Battery Volunteer Light Artillery, under command of Lieut. Col. M. C. Trenmann. Los Banos occupied by United States troops.
- Aug. 1. Expedition, Company D, Sixth Infantry, from Yaballa, under B. A. Byrne, captain, against Caparico's bandits, after destroying their villages and capturing stock August 2 and 3, returns August 4. Company H, Sixth United States Infantry, leaves Yaballa, Negros, on expedition to Paupical, P. I. Company K, Sixth United States Infantry, starts on expedition to mountains in pursuit of bandits.
2. Transport *Indiana* sails for Manila with detachment of recruits and casuals under command of Col. C. C. Hood, Sixteenth United States Infantry. Company H, Twenty-first Infantry, and platoon of Battery E, First United States Artillery, proceed in cascos from Calamba to Los Banos. Insurgents make feint on Calamba during night.
9. Detachment Sixth United States Infantry starts on scouting expedition north and west of San Isidro, Luzon. Troops of the Second Division make a general advance toward the north and west and capture towns of Bacolor, Calulut, and Suidalon.
10. Transport *Morgan City* sails for Manila with detachment of recruits under command of Maj. W. Wittich, Twenty-first United States Infantry. Expedition under command of Brig. Gen. Theodore Schwan arrived at Manila. Sailed from San Francisco July 13, 1899. President authorizes organization of a volunteer cavalry regiment to be known as the Eleventh Regiment of Cavalry, U. S. V.
11. Transport *Sheridan* sails from Manila with the Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteer Infantry and First South Dakota Volunteer Infantry, under command of Col. A. S. Frost.
12. Troops Second Division occupy towns of Angeles and Dolores. A reconnaissance in force up the San Mateo Valley disperses the insurgents and occupies the town of San Mateo.
15. Transport *Senator* leaves San Francisco, Cal., for Manila, P. I., with 11 officers and 668 enlisted men (recruits), under command of Lieut. Col. E. M. Hayes, Fourth United States Cavalry. Colonel Childers, Major McGuire, and Companies E, F, G, and I, First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, have skirmish with insurgents near La Paz, P. I. Detachments of Companies A, K, L, M, Thirty-sixth Volunteer Infantry, in an engagement near Bacolor, P. I.
16. Battery E, First Artillery, and Companies B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, L, and M, Twelfth United States Infantry, engage the insurgents at Angeles, P. I., and Company K, Twelfth United States Infantry, at Dolores, P. I. Engagement by Company E and detachments of Companies A, K, L, M, Thirty-sixth Volunteer Infantry, at Guagua, P. I.
17. President authorizes organization of 10 additional regiments of volunteers, Thirty-eighth to Forty-seventh, inclusive.
18. Transport *Conemaugh*, which sailed from San Francisco July 11, 1899, arrives at Manila. Transport *City of Sydney* sails for Manila with a detachment of recruits, under command of Capt. F. H. Albright, Twenty-fifth United States Infantry.
19. Lieutenants Heidt and Putnam, Company M, Sixth United States Infantry, in expedition with 31 men against Fort Luis and San Isidro, Luzon, P. I. Engagement by detachments of Companies B and M, Sixth United States Infantry, near Tabuan, P. I., and Battery E, Third Artillery, and Companies E, G, H, and I, Twelfth United States Infantry, near Angeles, P. I.
20. Transport *Garrone* sails for Manila with detachment of Third United States Cavalry and 389 horses, under command of First Lieut. E. M. Suplee, Third United States Cavalry.
21. Expedition under command of Col. S. Snyder, Nineteenth United States Infantry, arrives at Manila. Sailed from San Francisco July 25, 1899.
22. Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry mustered out at San Francisco, Cal.
23. First Nebraska Volunteer Infantry mustered out at San Francisco, Cal. Transports *Valencia* and *Zealandia* sail from Manila with First Montana Volunteer Infantry, under command of Col. H. C. Kessler. Detachment Company M, Twenty-third United States Infantry, engage insurgents at El Pardo, P. I.
24. Command of Maj. O. J. Sweet, which sailed from San Francisco July 26, 1899, arrives at Manila.
25. Transport *Athenian* sails for Manila with Troop D, Third United States Cavalry, under command of Capt. G. F. Chase, Third United States Cavalry; transport *St. Paul* sails for Manila with Troops A, C, E, F, K, L, and M, Third United States Cavalry, under command of Lieut. Col. H. W. Wessells, jr., Third United States Cavalry.

1899.
Aug. 26. Lieutenant-Colonel Bayless, First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, with M and K companies, Eighteenth United States Infantry, two companies of Sixth Infantry, one company of the First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and one piece of artillery, made expedition against insurgents northwest of Pardo; enemy shelled and driven from works.
29. Transport *City of Puebla* sails for Manila with detachment of recruits, under command of Capt. B. D. Devore, Twenty-third United States Infantry; Company H, Sixth United States Infantry, drive insurgents from the village of Argogula, P. I., killing several.
- Sept. 1. Transport *Indiana* arrives at Manila, P. I., with 10 officers and 804 enlisted men (recruits); transport *Victoria* sails for Manila with detachment of Third United States Cavalry; Companies D and E, Seventeenth United States Infantry, engage insurgents at Dolores, P. I.
2. Transport *Morgan City* is wrecked in Inland Sea, Japan; transport *Leelanaw* sails for Manila with detachment of Fourth United States Cavalry and 250 horses; the President authorizes the organization of two additional regiments, to be known as the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Regiments of Infantry, United States Volunteers; transport *Warren* sails for Manila with detachment Signal Corps and recruits, under command of Capt. T. W. Moore, Twenty-first Infantry.
3. Detachment of Company A, Thirty-sixth United States Volunteer Infantry, engages insurgents near Porac, P. I.
5. First Washington Infantry, United States Volunteers (42 officers and 776 enlisted men), leaves Manila, P. I., on transport *Pennsylvania*, en route to San Francisco, Cal., for muster out.
8. Transport *Columbia* sails for Manila with headquarters, band, E. F. G. H., and L, Thirty-fourth Volunteer Infantry, and 3 Hospital Corps men, under command of Col. L. W. V. Kennon, Thirty-fourth Volunteer Infantry.
9. Insurgents make a general attack on Santa Rita, Guagua, and Angeles, Luzon, but are repulsed after a short engagement.
9. Detachment of Company A, Thirty-sixth Volunteer Infantry, encounter insurgents near Porac, P. I.; Battery F, Fifth Artillery, near Imus, P. I., and Companies F and C, Seventeenth United States Infantry, near Arayat, P. I.
11. Companies B and I, Seventeenth United States Infantry, engage insurgents near Calulut, P. I.
13. Company K, Twenty-third United States Infantry, engages insurgents in the Acan Valley, P. I.
15. Detachment of Company E, Twenty-first United States Infantry, engage insurgents near Calamba, P. I.; detachment Company L, Thirty-sixth Volunteer Infantry, at Guagua, P. I., and Companies F and E, First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, near La Paz, P. I.
16. Transport *Astec* sails for Manila with detachment Fourth United States Cavalry and 368 horses. Transport *Belgian King* sails for Manila with A, B, C, D, I, K, and M, Thirty-fourth Volunteer Infantry. Company L, Sixth United States Infantry, engages insurgents at Isabella, P. I.; Company A, Twenty-third United States Infantry, Company H, First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and detachments of Companies A and C, Sixth Infantry, engage insurgents near Moalboal, P. I.
17. Provisional brigade with headquarters established at San Fernando, organized, and Brigadier-General Young is placed in command. It comprises the following: Fourth Cavalry (10 troops), Twenty-fourth Infantry (8 companies), Thirty-seventh Infantry (2 companies), Love's scouts (men detached from companies), Batson's scouts (Macabebe), 2 troops, 200 Macabebe natives enlisted for a three months' term.
18. Transport *Ohio* arrives at Manila, P. I., with 7 officers and 689 enlisted men taken from the transport *Morgan City* wrecked in Inland Sea, September 2, 1899. Detachment of Company F, Seventeenth Infantry, engage insurgents at Casaiabas, P. I.
22. Twenty-seventh United States Volunteer Infantry sails from San Francisco, Cal., on United States transports *Tacoma* and *George W. Elder* for Manila.
22. Detachments Sixth Artillery, Sixth Infantry, Nineteenth Infantry, Twenty-third Infantry, and First Tennessee engage insurgents near Cebu, island of Cebu. Companies G and M, Seventeenth Infantry, engage insurgents at Gondis, P. I.
23. Insurgents wreck and ambush train near Angeles, Luzon, killing 2 and wounding 3 men. Insurgents put to flight with a loss of 8 of their men killed. Thirtieth United States Infantry Volunteers sails from San Francisco, Cal., on United States transport *Sherman* for Manila, P. I. Company K, Twenty-third Infantry, engages insurgents near Cebu, island of Cebu.
25. Transport *Grant* sails for Manila with Twenty-sixth Volunteer Infantry.
27. Detachment Twenty-fourth Infantry engages insurgents near Mexico, P. I.
28. Detachments Fourth Cavalry, Third Artillery, Ninth Infantry, and Thirty-sixth Infantry, Companies A, H, K, and L, Seventeenth Infantry, engage insurgents near Porac, P. I.
29. Detachments Fourth Infantry and Fifth Artillery engage insurgents near Imus, P. I., and Company A, Twenty-first Infantry, near Los Bancos, P. I.
30. Skirmish by Fourth Infantry at Imus, P. I. Transport *Sheridan* sails for Manila with Thirty-third Volunteer Infantry, and Companies B, H, and I, Thirty-second Infantry.
- Oct. 1. Transport *Charles Nelson* sails for Manila with field and staff and Companies C and D, Thirty-second Volunteer Infantry. Transport *Glenogle* sails for Manila with headquarters, Companies A, E, F, G, H, K, L, and M, Thirty-second Volunteer Infantry, and detachment of men for Thirty-first and Thirty-third Volunteer Infantry. Engagements by detachments Sixth Infantry and Hospital Corps near Tabuan, P. I., and by Companies I and G, Twenty-second Infantry, near Arayat, P. I.
2. Skirmish by detachments Fifth Artillery, Signal Corps, Fourteenth Infantry, and Fourth Infantry near Imus, P. I.
8. Detachments Fifth Artillery, Fourth Infantry, and Fourteenth Infantry encounter insurgents near Imus, P. I.; Company B, Fourth Cavalry near Santa Ana, P. I.; detachment Company A, Fourth Cavalry, near Santa Cruz, P. I.; detachments Fifth Artillery and Second Infantry at Calamba, P. I.; detachments Companies E and M, Seventeenth Infantry, near Calulut, P. I., and Ninth Infantry at Guagua, P. I.
4. Thirty-fifth United States Volunteer Infantry sails from Portland, Oreg., on transports *Sikh* and *City of Rio*, en route for Manila, P. I. Detachment Twenty-second Infantry engages insurgents at Arayat, P. I.
1899.
Oct. 5. Detachment Fourth Infantry engages insurgents at Binacayan, P. I. Twenty-ninth United States Volunteer Infantry sails from San Francisco, Cal., on U. S. transports *Zealandia* and *City of Para* for Manila, P. I.
6. Engagements by Company K, Twenty-fourth Infantry, at Santa Ana, P. I.; Company K, Sixteenth Infantry, at Jolo, P. I.; detachments Fifth Artillery and Fourth Infantry at Imus, P. I., and detachments Fifth Artillery, Fourth Infantry, and Fourteenth Infantry at Binacayan, P. I.
7. Expedition starts into the Province of Cavite, P. I., under command of Brig. Gen. Theodore Schwan, United States Volunteers. The command consisted of the following organizations: Thirtieth Infantry (11 companies), Fourteenth Infantry (3 companies), Third Cavalry (1 troop), Fourth Cavalry (1 troop), Fifth Artillery (Battalion F), Lowe's Scouts (1 company), Engineers (1 company), Hospital Corps (detachment), Signal Corps (detachment). (Aggregate strength, 1,571 soldiers). Engagements occurred at or near Cavite Viejo, Rosario, Santa Cruz, Buena Vista, and San Francisco, Province of Cavite, P. I. The enemy lost during these engagements about 100 killed and 400 wounded. Our loss was 5 officers wounded (3 mortally) and 15 enlisted men. Detachment Company B, Sixth Infantry, engages insurgents at Sagajon River, P. I., and detachment Twenty-fourth Infantry at St. Augustin, P. I.
8. Engagements by detachments Fourth Infantry and Hospital Corps near San Nicolas, P. I. Detachments Fifth Artillery, Fourth Cavalry, Fourteenth Infantry, and Thirtieth Infantry at Novaleta, P. I., and detachment Company L, Fourteenth Infantry, near San Mateo, P. I.
9. Engagement by detachment Thirty-sixth Infantry at Florida Blanca, P. I. Detachment Sixteenth Infantry at Mayanayan, P. I. Detachments Fourteenth Infantry and Nineteenth Infantry near San Mateo, P. I. Detachment Sixteenth Infantry and band near Calocan, P. I., and detachments Fourth Artillery and Twenty-fifth Infantry at La Loma, P. I.
10. Engagement by detachment Fourteenth Infantry at San Mateo, P. I. Detachments Fifth Artillery and Thirtieth Infantry near San Francisco de Malabon, P. I., and Company A, Corps of Engineers, at Santa Cruz, P. I.
11. Transports *Columbia* and *Belgian King*, with Thirty-fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, arrive at Manila, P. I. Ninth Infantry, Twelfth Infantry, and Seventeenth Infantry engage insurgents at Angeles, P. I.
12. Engagements by detachments Thirty-seventh Infantry and Hospital Corps near Muntinlupa, P. I. Detachments Fourth Cavalry, Twenty-fourth Infantry, and Thirty-seventh Infantry at Arayat, P. I., and Company H, Sixteenth Infantry, at Bag Bag Bridge, Bag Bag River, P. I.
13. Skirmish by detachment Fourth Cavalry near San Roque, P. I.
15. Detachment Sixteenth Infantry engages insurgents near Guiguinto, P. I.
16. Ninth Infantry, Twelfth Infantry, Seventeenth Infantry, and detachment Hospital Corps engage insurgents at Angeles, P. I.
17. Engagements by Thirty-sixth Infantry near Dolores, P. I., and detachment Company D, Sixteenth Infantry, at Marilao Bridge, Marilao River, P. I.
19. Engagements by Company L, Fourth Cavalry, at Cabiao, P. I.; detachments Fourth Cavalry, Twenty-second Infantry, Thirty-seventh Infantry, and Hospital Corps at San Isidro, P. I.; detachment Company M, Eighteenth Infantry, at Jaro, P. I.; detachment Nineteenth Infantry at Lulus Mountains, P. I., and detachment Company L, Sixth Infantry, at Bag, P. I.
21. Transport *Sherman* with Thirtieth United States Volunteer Infantry arrives at Manila, P. I.; engagements by detachment Sixth Infantry near Isabela, P. I., and detachment Sixth Infantry near San Carlos, P. I.
22. Scouts Thirty-fourth Infantry and quartermaster employees attacked by insurgents at Rio Grande (River), P. I.
26. Twenty-eighth United States Volunteer Infantry sails from San Francisco, Cal., on U. S. transports *Tartar* and *Newport* for Manila, P. I.
27. Transports *Tacoma* and *George W. Elder*, with Twenty-seventh United States Volunteer Infantry, arrive at Manila, P. I.; transports *Charles Nelson*, *Sheridan*, and *Glenogle*, with Thirty-second United States Volunteer Infantry, arrive at Manila, P. I.
- Nov. 2. Engagements by Macabebe scouts and detachment Fourth Cavalry near Allaga, P. I.; detachment Thirty-sixth Infantry near Lubac, P. I., and detachments Fourth Cavalry and Thirty-sixth Infantry at Porac, P. I.
3. Thirty-ninth United States Volunteer Infantry sails from Portland, Oreg., on U. S. transports *Pennsylvania* and *Olympia* for Manila. Detachment Fourth Cavalry engages insurgents near Talavera, P. I. Portion of Forty-fifth United States Volunteer Infantry sails from San Francisco, Cal., on U. S. transport *Olympia* for Manila, P. I.
4. Forty-seventh United States Volunteer Infantry sails from New York City on U. S. transport *Thomas* for Manila, P. I. Detachment Thirty-sixth Infantry engages insurgents near Porac, P. I.
5. Companies D, H, K, L (First Battalion), and A, B, G, and I (Third Battalion), Seventeenth Infantry, in an engagement, assisted by Light Battery E, First Artillery, and detachment Signal Corps, near and in the town of Magalang, province of Pampanga, Luzon, P. I., killed 16 of the enemy and wounded 128; our loss, 9 wounded. An expeditionary brigade, under command of Brig. Gen. Loyd Wheaton, United States Volunteers, consisting of the Thirtieth Infantry, eleven companies of Thirty-third Volunteers, one platoon Battery L, Sixth Artillery, and detachment of engineers and Signal Corps (about 2,000 soldiers), embarked at Manila, P. I., on expedition to Lingayen, San Fabian, San Jacinto, and vicinity.
6. One piece of artillery from Battery E of the First Artillery and Company A, Seventeenth Infantry, in a skirmish with the insurgents north of Magalang, Pampanga Province, Luzon, P. I., killed several and wounded a considerable number; no loss to United States forces.
7. Detachments Fourth Cavalry, First Artillery, Third Artillery, and Thirty-sixth Infantry encounter insurgents at Mababacot, P. I. San Fabian, Luzon, P. I., is occupied after a combined naval and land attack by about 2,000 soldiers, under command of Brig. Gen. Loyd Wheaton, and naval troops under Commander Henry Knox. Detachment Fourth Cavalry encounter insurgents at Talavera, P. I.

- 1899.
- Nov. 8. Major March, with a battalion of Thirty-third Volunteers, consisting of Companies B, E, G, and H, have a running engagement with about 200 or 300 of the insurgents near Magalang, Luzon, P. I., in which 9 insurgents are killed and 2 wounded; no casualties to United States forces. Detachment Thirtieth Infantry encounters insurgents at San Jacinto, P. I.
9. Detachments Fourth Cavalry and Thirty-sixth Infantry encounter insurgents near Bamban, P. I.
10. Battalion of Thirty-third Volunteers, Companies B, E, G, and H, under Major March, have second engagement near Magalang, Luzon, P. I., with about 600 insurgents under Colonel Carlos. Seventy insurgents are killed and many wounded; Colonel Carlos among those killed; casualties to United States troops, 2 wounded. Companies A and C, Seventeenth Infantry, in an engagement at Masapinit, province of Pampanga, Luzon, P. I., kill 29 insurgents and capture 4 prisoners; casualties to United States forces, 3 wounded.
11. Company I, Seventeenth Infantry, and Troops E and K, Fourth Cavalry, in a short engagement with the insurgents on the Masapinit-Concepcion road, near Masapinit, Luzon, P. I., kill several and wound several more; casualties to United States forces, 2 killed and 1 wounded. Four soldiers of Troop K, Fourth Cavalry, in an engagement with 12 insurgents near Concepcion, province of Pampanga, Luzon, P. I., kill 1 lieutenant and 2 privates, wound 1 and capture 5. The Thirty-third Volunteers, in an engagement with about 1,400 insurgents at San Jacinto, Luzon, P. I., kill 134 of the enemy and wound a great many; casualties to United States forces, 1 officer killed Major (Logan) and 2 enlisted men, 14 wounded.
12. Detachment Third Cavalry engage insurgents at Boagalong, P. I., detachment Nineteenth Infantry near San Blas, P. I., and detachment Third Cavalry at Asingan, P. I.
13. Buen Camino, one of the principal leaders in the insurrection, captured by members of First Battalion, Thirty-third Volunteers (Companies A, B, C, D). They also capture an adjutant, secretary to Aguinaldo; child, son of Aguinaldo, and Aguinaldo's mother. Detachment Forty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, embark at New York City on U. S. transport *Meade*, and detachment Forty-fifth Infantry, United States Volunteers, and Forty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers, at San Francisco, Cal., on U. S. transports *Benmohr* and *City of Sidney*, respectively, for Manila, P. I.
14. Forty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers, and detachment Forty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, embark at New York City on U. S. transport *Logan*, and the Forty-fourth Infantry, United States Volunteers, and detachment Forty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, at San Francisco, Cal., on the U. S. transports *Hancock* and *City of Puebla* for Manila, P. I.
15. Thirty-eighth United States Volunteer Infantry sails from San Francisco, Cal., on U. S. transports *Duke of Fife* and *St. Paul* for Manila, P. I.
16. Company F, Thirty-third Volunteers and detachment of United States Engineers in an engagement with the insurgents, 600 strong, drive them from their station at Mangatarem, Luzon, P. I., killing a considerable number.
17. The Thirty-sixth Infantry and Company F, Thirty-third Volunteers, in an engagement with the insurgents in the Gamboles Mountains near Mangatarem, Luzon, P. I., entirely disperse the enemy, capturing all of the artillery (14 pieces), arsenals, stores, etc.
- Dec. 2. Detachment of Forty-ninth United States Volunteer Infantry sails from San Francisco, Cal., on U. S. transport *Warren* for Manila, P. I. Detachment Thirty-third Infantry engages insurgents at Tila Pass, P. I.
3. Detachment Twenty-fourth Infantry engages the insurgents at San Luis, P. I.
- 4-5. Detachments Third Artillery, Third Infantry, and Sixteenth Infantry encounter the enemy at San Ildefonso, P. I.
6. Detachment of Forty-ninth United States Volunteer Infantry sails from San Francisco, Cal., on U. S. transport *Sherman* for Manila, P. I. Detachments Third Artillery and Third Infantry and Sixteenth Infantry engage insurgents at Maasin, P. I.
7. Detachment Sixth Infantry engage the insurgents at La Granja, P. I.
8. Detachments Third-second Infantry and Third Infantry engage the insurgents at Olongapo, P. I.
9. Action between detachment Twenty-fifth Infantry and insurgents at Iba, P. I.
10. Action between detachments Third Infantry and Thirty-second Infantry and insurgents at Subig Bay, P. I.
11. Action between detachments Third Artillery, Third Infantry, and Sixteenth Infantry and insurgents at Ildefonso, P. I.
12. Action between detachment Fourth Cavalry and insurgents near Biaco, P. I.
13. Action between detachment Fourth Cavalry and insurgents near San Miguel, P. I.
14. Action between detachments Thirty-third and Thirty-fourth Infantry and the insurgents near Dingras, P. I.
15. Action between detachment Third-second Infantry and insurgents at Morong, P. I.
16. Action between detachment Twenty-fifth Infantry and insurgents at Iba, P. I.
17. Action between detachments Fourth Cavalry, Eleventh Cavalry, Twenty-seventh Infantry, and Twenty-ninth Infantry and insurgents at San Mateo, P. I.
18. Action between detachment Seventeenth Infantry and insurgents at Cantapang, P. I.
19. Action between detachment Thirty-sixth Infantry and insurgents near Alos, P. I.
20. Action between detachment Twenty-sixth Infantry and insurgents at Lara, P. I.
21. Action between detachment Thirty-fourth Infantry and insurgents near Aritos, P. I.
22. Action between detachments Twenty-first Infantry, Thirty-seventh Infantry, and insurgents near Calamba, P. I.
23. Action between detachments Sixth Artillery, Eleventh Cavalry, Twenty-seventh Infantry, Twenty-ninth Infantry, and Forty-fifth Infantry and insurgents at Montalbon, P. I.
24. Action between detachment Twenty-fourth Infantry and insurgents at Talavera Road, P. I.
25. Action between detachment Twenty-fourth Infantry and insurgents at Bongabong, P. I.
26. Twelfth Infantry engages the insurgents at Panique, P. I.
- 1900.
- Jan. 1. Action between detachments Fifth Artillery and Thirty-ninth Infantry and insurgents at San Cristobal, P. I.

- 1900.
- Jan. 2. Action between detachments Fifth Artillery and Thirty-ninth Infantry and insurgents at Binan, P. I.
3. Action between detachment Thirty-ninth Infantry and insurgents at Carmona, P. I.
4. Transport *Logan* with Forty-first United States Volunteer Infantry arrives at Manila, P. I.
5. Action between detachment Twenty-fifth Infantry and insurgents at Comansil, P. I.
6. Action between Sixth Artillery, Fourth Cavalry, Eleventh Cavalry, Forty-sixth Infantry, and Thirtieth Infantry and insurgents near Binan, P. I.
7. Action between Fourth and Eleventh Cavalry and the insurgents near Indang, P. I.
8. Action between Sixth Artillery, Nineteenth Infantry, Twenty-third Infantry, and Forty-fourth Infantry and the insurgents at Sudlon Mountains, P. I.
9. Action between Fourth and Eleventh Cavalry and the insurgents at Naic, P. I.
10. Action between Thirtieth Infantry and the insurgents near Magallanes, P. I.
11. Action Fifth Artillery, Thirty-ninth Infantry, and Thirty-seventh Infantry with insurgents near Santo Tomas, P. I.
12. Action between Third Cavalry and the insurgents near Sidapin, P. I.
13. Action between Fifth Artillery, Thirty-eighth Infantry, and Thirty-ninth Infantry and the insurgents near Lipa, P. I.
14. Action between Fourth Cavalry, Eleventh Cavalry and the insurgents near San Pablo, P. I.
15. Action between Fourth and Eleventh Cavalry and the insurgents at Tiaru, P. I.
16. Action between Fourth Cavalry, Thirty-sixth Infantry, and Thirty-ninth Infantry and the insurgents at Batangas, P. I.
17. Action between Fifth Artillery and Thirty-ninth Infantry and the insurgents near Rosario, P. I.
18. Action between Sixth Artillery and Nineteenth Infantry and the insurgents at Antique, P. I.
19. Action between Eleventh Cavalry and Forty-fifth Infantry and the insurgents near Magallanes, P. I.
20. Action between Sixth Artillery, Thirtieth Infantry, Thirty-seventh Infantry, and Thirty-ninth Infantry and the insurgents near San Pablo, P. I.
21. Santa Cruz occupied by three companies Thirty-seventh Volunteers, under Major Boyd, assisted by gunboats *Laguna de Bay*, *Oste*, *Florida*, and *Nipan*. Balinocquin captured by a detachment of Thirty-sixth Volunteers, under Major Bishop; 3 men wounded; enemy lost 9 killed, 4 wounded, 10 prisoners. Action between detachment Seventeenth Infantry and the insurgents at Tubac, P. I.
22. Action between Fourth Cavalry, Thirty-ninth Infantry, and the insurgents at Majayjay, P. I.
23. Action between Eleventh Cavalry, Forty-fifth Infantry, and the insurgents near Magallanes, P. I.
24. Transport *Grant* with Forty-eighth United States Volunteer Infantry arrives at Manila, P. I. Action between Thirty-eighth Infantry and the insurgents near Lipa, P. I.
25. Action between Forty-seventh Infantry and the insurgents at Donso, P. I. Second Battalion, Forty-third Volunteers, under Major Gilmore, occupies Calboyok, Samar, without loss to our troops.
26. Action between Thirty-seventh and Thirty-ninth Infantry and the insurgents at Sampalac, P. I.
27. Action between Forty-seventh Infantry and the insurgents at Donso, P. I.
28. Action between Thirty-fourth Infantry and the insurgents near San Isidro, P. I.
- Feb. 1. Action between Twelfth Infantry and the insurgents at Tulipa, P. I.
2. Action between Thirty-eighth Infantry and the insurgents at Barrio Talumpoc, P. I. Action at Legaspi, P. I., between Company E, commanded by Capt. A. U. Betts, Forty-seventh Infantry, and insurgents. Sergeant Craig and 3 others wounded.
3. Action Forty-third Infantry with the insurgents near Nájore, P. I.
4. Action between Thirtieth Infantry and the insurgents near Sampalac, P. I.
5. Action between Thirty-ninth Infantry and the insurgents at Ticao, P. I.
6. Action between Nineteenth Infantry and the insurgents near Candelaria, P. I. The transport *Venus* arrives at Manila, having on board 26 American ex-Filipino prisoners of war, including Lieutenant Gilmore and the survivors of the *Yorktown's* crew and 3 of the *Urdaneta* survivors.
7. Action between Fourth and Eleventh Cavalry and Thirty-seventh Infantry and the insurgents near Magdalena, P. I.
8. Action between Third Artillery, Fortieth Infantry, and Forty-seventh Infantry and the insurgents at Darago, P. I.
9. Action between Third Artillery and Forty-seventh Infantry and the insurgents at Tabaco, P. I.
10. Action between Thirtieth Infantry and the insurgents near Tayabas, P. I.
11. Action between Fortieth Infantry and the insurgents near Albay, P. I.
12. Action between Twenty-seventh Infantry and the insurgents at barrio Bartolome, P. I.
13. Action between Ninth Infantry and the insurgents at Tinuba, P. I.
14. Action between detachments Sixth Artillery and Nineteenth Infantry at Cavitan, P. I.
15. Action near Magdalena, P. I., between detachment Thirty-seventh Infantry and insurgents.
16. Action near Castellana, P. I., between detachment Forty-fourth Infantry and insurgents.
17. Action near San Juan, P. I., between detachment Third Cavalry and insurgents.
18. Action at Lucban, P. I., between detachment Thirtieth Infantry and insurgents.
19. Action at Libmanan, P. I., between detachments Thirty-seventh and Fortieth Infantry and insurgents.
20. Action at Caliuog, P. I., between detachment Twenty-sixth Infantry and insurgents.
21. Action at Camalig, P. I., between detachments Third Artillery and Fortieth Infantry and insurgents.
22. Action at Guinobatan, P. I., between detachments Third Artillery and Fortieth Infantry and insurgents.
23. Action at Sevilla, P. I., between detachment Thirtieth Infantry and insurgents.

- 1900.
- Feb. 25. Action at Alaminos, P. I., between detachment Thirty-sixth Infantry and insurgents.
26. Action near San Juan, P. I., between detachment Third Cavalry and insurgents.
27. Action near Liguao, P. I., between detachment Fortieth Infantry and insurgents.
28. Action at Tagun, P. I., between detachment Sixteenth Infantry and insurgents.
- Mar. 1. Action at Linao, P. I., between detachments Sixteenth Infantry and Hospital Corps and insurgents.
2. Action at Barrio de Antipolo, P. I., between detachment Forty-fifth Infantry and insurgents.
3. Action near Antimonan, P. I., between detachment Thirtieth Infantry and insurgents.
4. Action at Paete, P. I., between detachment Forty-second Infantry and insurgents.
5. Action at Cabugao, P. I., between detachment Thirty-third Infantry and insurgents.
6. Action at Penaranda, P. I., between detachments Thirty-fourth Infantry and Hospital Corps and insurgents.
7. Action near Magdalena, P. I., between detachment Thirty-seventh Infantry and insurgents.
8. Action near Matiginao, Samar, between Company H, Forty-third Volunteers, and insurgents, in which two were killed, and Lieut. Joseph Thomas Sweeney and 3 others wounded.
9. Action at Bugason, P. I., between detachment Eighteenth Infantry and insurgents.
10. Action at Valderrama, P. I., between detachments Nineteenth and Forty-fourth Infantry and insurgents.
11. Action at Paranas, Samar, between Company M, Forty-third Infantry Volunteers, under command of Lieutenant Andrews, and insurgents. Casualties to United States troops, 3 wounded.
12. Action at Hilongos, P. I., between detachment Forty-third Infantry and insurgents.
13. Action at Puerta Rivas, P. I., between detachment Thirty-second Infantry and Macabebe scouts and insurgents.
14. Action at Guinobatan, P. I., between detachments Fortieth and Forty-seventh Infantry and insurgents.
15. Action at Guisadian, P. I., between detachments Eighteenth and Nineteenth Infantry and insurgents.
17. Action on Rio de Pampango, P. I., between detachments Fourth Cavalry, Thirty-fourth Infantry, scouts Thirty-second Infantry, and Macabebe scouts and insurgents.
18. Action at Polangui, P. I., between detachments Thirty-seventh and Forty-fifth Infantry and insurgents.
19. Action at Legas Pass, P. I., between Thirty-seventh Infantry and insurgents.
20. Action near Camalig, P. I., between Thirty-seventh and Forty-fifth Infantry and insurgents.
21. Action at La Granja, P. I., between detachment Forty-third Infantry and insurgents.
22. Action near Cavinti, P. I., between detachment Thirty-seventh Infantry and insurgents.
23. Action at Camalig, P. I., between detachments Thirty-seventh and Forty-fifth Infantry and insurgents.
24. Action near Bisanon, Samar, under Lieutenant Andrews, Forty-third Volunteers. One enlisted man of Company L and 1 of Company I wounded.
25. Sixteen men under a sergeant of Company A, Eighteenth Infantry, in returning to Capiz, Panay, surprised a band of 30 insurgents, killing 2, wounding several, and taking 1 prisoner. Action near Batangas, P. I., between detachment Thirty-eighth Infantry and insurgents.
26. Action at Calbayok, Samar, under Captain Fair, Forty-third Volunteers. Casualties to United States troops, 2 killed and 2 wounded.
27. Action at Gandara, Samar, under Lieutenant Stewart, Forty-third Volunteers. No casualties to United States troops, but considerable loss to enemy.
28. Action at Mabalsat, P. I., between detachment Ninth Infantry and insurgents.
29. Action between detachment Forty-second Infantry and insurgents near Paete, P. I.
30. Action between detachments Eighteenth and Nineteenth Infantry and insurgents at Barboza, P. I.
- Apr. 1. Action near San Jose, Samar, between a detachment of Company I, Forty-third Infantry, under Sergeant Hoover, and insurgents.
2. Lieutenant Stedje, Company L, Forty-seventh Infantry, in making a scout from Gubat to Santa Marie, Luzon, killed 12 insurgents and captured 7.
3. Action at Cavitan, P. I., between detachment of Nineteenth Infantry and insurgents.
4. Action near San Vicente, P. I., between detachments Thirteenth and Twenty-fourth Infantry and insurgents.
5. Action near Lambunao, P. I., between detachment Twenty-sixth Infantry and insurgents.
6. Action near Balocang, P. I., between detachment Third Cavalry and insurgents.
7. Action near Mayantoc, P. I., between detachments Fourth Cavalry and Seventeenth Infantry and insurgents.
8. Action at Nueva Caceres, P. I., between detachment Forty-fifth Infantry and insurgents.
9. Action near San Manuel, P. I., between detachment Thirteenth Infantry and insurgents.
10. Action at Lavazares, Samar, Forty-third Volunteers, under Lieutenant Seaman. No casualties to United States troops, but heavy loss to insurgents.
11. Action near San Jose, Samar, Forty-third Volunteer Infantry, under Lieutenant Morris, and insurgents.
12. Action near Niporo, Samar, under Captain Fair, Forty-third Volunteers. Wounded: First Lieut. Henry J. Stewart, adjutant Second Battalion.
13. A rebel force, mostly religious fanatics, 100 strong, attack the city of Santa Cruz, Luzon, garrisoned by 3 companies of Thirty-seventh Volunteers. The rebels repulsed with considerable loss in killed and wounded. Two companies of the Twenty-ninth Volunteers also participated in defense of Santa Cruz. Action at Barrio Sanchez, P. I., between detachment Thirteenth Infantry and insurgents.
14. Action near Paquil, P. I., between detachment Forty-second Infantry and insurgents.

- 1900.
- Apr. 15. The garrison Catubig, Island of Samar, P. I., consisting of 31 men of Company H, Forty-third Infantry, is surrounded by a body of some 600 insurgents; driven from their barracks to a hastily constructed trench they maintain a siege of four days, when, after 19 men have been killed and 4 of the others wounded, the survivors are rescued on the 19th by 10 men of Company H, under Lieutenant Sweeney; insurgents killed known to be over 200, and many wounded.
16. Action at Batac, P. I., between detachments Third Cavalry, Thirty-fourth Infantry, and insurgents.
17. Action at Lavag, P. I., between detachments Third Cavalry, Thirty-fourth Infantry, and insurgents.
18. Captain Scranton, Thirtieth Infantry, with 56 men, rescue 50 Spanish prisoners and capture 1 insurgent major and several ladrones near Sariaya, Luzon, P. I.
19. Action at Colasi, P. I., between detachment Nineteenth Infantry and insurgents.
20. Captain Latimer, Thirtieth Infantry, and 50 men capture 1 insurgent captain, 1 lieutenant, and 12 soldiers at Antimonan, Luzon, and rescue 225 Spanish prisoners. Action near Pilar, P. I., between detachment Thirty-third Infantry and insurgents.
21. Action at San Nicolas, P. I., between detachment Third Cavalry and insurgents.
22. Action at Candaba, P. I., between detachment Thirty-fifth Infantry and insurgents.
23. Action near Bangar, P. I., between detachment Forty-eighth Infantry and insurgents.
24. Action near Lacado, P. I., between detachment Thirty-third Infantry and insurgents.
25. Action near Paguil, P. I., between detachment Forty-second Infantry and insurgents.
27. Action at Legaspi, P. I., between detachment Forty-seventh Infantry and insurgents.
28. Action at Muntinlupa, P. I., between detachment Twenty-first Infantry and insurgents.
29. Action at Malabon, P. I., between detachment Thirty-first Infantry and insurgents. Captain Hankins, with his company, F, Forty-eighth Volunteers, practically annihilates a band of 50 insurgents in barracks at Tomorong, Luzon. No casualties to United States forces.
30. Lieutenant May, with 20 native scouts, in an engagement with the insurgents at Barrio Cabaritan, Luzon, kill 2, wound 3, and capture 4 insurgents; a considerable amount of ammunition is captured. Company F, Forty-third Volunteers, under Captain Cooke, are attacked at Catarman, Samar, by insurgents 1,000 strong. Engagement lasts about six hours, when the insurgents are routed, with a loss of 154 killed. Our loss, 2 wounded. Action near Mannoag, P. I., between detachment Fourth Cavalry and insurgents.
- May 3. Lieutenant Jeffries, Thirty-third Volunteers, with a detachment from Thirty-third Volunteers, in an engagement with the insurgents at Lungbol, Luzon, kills 14; wounds several. Lieutenant McClelland and 30 men, Thirty-third Volunteers, near Candon, Luzon, wounds and captures Captain Abasa, bandit, killing 4 of his band and wounding 2 more. No casualties to United States forces.
4. Major Laws, Thirty-fifth Volunteers, near San Miguel Silus, captures 2 insurgent lieutenants and 1 private. Patrol Eleventh Cavalry, with native police, in returning to Naic, Luzon, are fired on by ladrones. One of our men wounded. Wounded ladrones captured.
5. Corporal Roston with 8 men, Company K, Twenty-fourth Infantry, in an engagement near San Quintin, Luzon, with 30 insurgents, capture 10 of them and considerable amount of ammunition.
6. One hundred men of Forty-third Infantry are ambushed by insurgents near Panbisan, Samar. Insurgents' loss, 12 killed. Casualties, United States forces, 1 wounded. Lieutenant O'Connor with company of Macabebes, 10 men from Company F, Thirteenth Infantry, and 3 native policemen in an engagement with 8 ladrones in Villages, P. I., killed 2 and take 2 prisoners. Ernesto V. Smith, assistant adjutant-general, captain, Fourth Infantry, with 40 men of the Fourth Cavalry, troop G, 30 of these under Lieutenant Day, Thirty-fourth Volunteers, capture Gen. Pantelon Garcia and Major Hilario in the town of Jaen, Luzon. Col. Arthur Murray, Forty-third Infantry, reports capture of Hilongas, Leyte. Our loss 4 wounded. Insurgents' loss 70 killed, 21 wounded; 50 prisoners, 5 guns, 14 rifles captured.
7. Lieutenant Jernigan, Forty-fourth Volunteers, surprises insurgent camp near San Juan de Guimba, killing 2 and capturing 21 rifles. No casualties to United States forces. About 75 insurgents and bolomen attack Candelaria, Zamboales, Luzon, and are repulsed with a loss of 3 killed and several wounded.
8. Captain Payson, Thirty-second Infantry, destroys two barracks at Gunnay, near Orion, Luzon.
9. Lieutenant Draper, Twenty-second Infantry, with 20 men (Twenty-second Infantry) in an engagement with insurgents on barrio of Santa Barbara, Luzon, kills 3, wounds several, and captures 30 guns and considerable ammunition.
10. Commanding officer of Company M, Forty-ninth Infantry, stationed at Plat, Luzon, reports capture near there of 14 ladrones, among whom are insurgent officers. Sergeant Schmirz, Company M, Twelfth Infantry, with a small detachment, captures 6 ladrones and considerable ammunition in a barrio of San Juan de Guimba, Luzon.
12. Joaquin Luna, commissary of funds for Aguinaldo, and Maj. Santos Noras, insurgent president of Balaoan, surrender to Major March, Thirty-third Volunteers, at Candon, Luzon, P. I. Major Baldwin, with a detachment of Twenty-second Infantry, capture a lieutenant and 9 insurgents on an angle of Rio Grande and Chico rivers in Luzon, P. I. No casualties to United States forces. Col. Vincent Prado, of the insurgent forces, captured by Captains Styer and Wild, of Thirteenth Infantry, in a barrio of Pozorubio, Luzon, P. I.
13. Lieutenant Miller, Thirty-second Infantry, near Samal, Luzon, P. I., captures 4 ladrones; 3 were killed in trying to escape. Colonel Duval, Forty-eighth Infantry, reports capture of Ancilio Mendoza and Lieutenant Lon Meliano with 3 men in barrio near Bangar, Luzon. Captain Hawkins, Forty-eighth Infantry, in an engagement near Balaoan, Luzon, with 20 insurgents, kills 6, wounds 1, and captures several rifles and 1,000 rounds ammunition.

1900.
May 14. Lieutenant Noble, with detachment Company F, Thirteenth Infantry, captures 21 ladrones in barrio of San Manuel, Luzon. Lieutenant Read, with 30 men from Company H, Thirteenth Infantry, in an engagement with 20 ladrones near San Manuel, Luzon, P. I., kills 1 ladrone and wounds 2 others. Lieutenant Coburn, Twenty-fifth Infantry, engages about 20 insurgents at Hobat, near Candelaria, Luzon; captures 3 insurgents; no casualties to United States troops. Sergeant Smith, with a detachment of Company M, Twelfth Infantry, in barrio of San Jose, Luzon, captures 6 ladrones, 9 rifles, and 100 rounds of ammunition. Detachment Thirty-fourth Volunteers met Natividad (insurgent general) and 75 riflemen and a number of bolomen at Quiem, Leyte; insurgent loss, 6 killed; casualties to United States forces, 1 wounded. Eighty soldiers of Companies I and K, in an engagement with the insurgents, 500 strong, at Agusan, Mindanao; insurgent loss, 52 killed; our loss, 2 killed and 3 wounded.
16. Col. Pablo Padilla and Lieut. Col. Casemaro Tino, 2 insurgent officers, are captured near Licup, Luzon, P. I.
19. Detachment Thirty-third Infantry encounters Aguinaldo and party of 100 insurgents at Sagad, P. I., and wounds a mounted officer, whose saddlebags contain Aguinaldo's papers since November, 1899. Captain Rucker, Thirty-third Volunteers, surprises Captain Tino and kills him, together with 23 of his men, near Malibong, Luzon, P. I.
20. Major Muir, and Company D, Thirty-eighth Infantry (57 strong), attacked main body of insurgents (125 strong) on island of Marinduque. Six insurgents killed, many wounded in flight; no casualties to United States forces. A detail of native scouts belonging to Lieutenant Parson's detachment are attacked near San Quintin, Abra Province, Luzon. Lieutenant Parson arrived with 35 men and dispersed the insurgents, killing 6.
22. Two companies of insurgents (170 aggregate strength) voluntarily surrender to Colonel Liscum at Tarlac, Luzon, P. I.
21. Sergeant Berry is instantly killed by shot in the head while rescuing the daughter of the president of Montalbon from the ladrones at Balayan, P. I. Four privates, with Sergeant Berry, kept up a return fire until reinforcements arrive, when the ladrones fled, with a loss of 7 killed. Lieutenant McGowan, with a detachment of Forty-eighth Volunteer Infantry, kills 7 bolomen and captures 16 more near Gallano, Luzon, P. I.
23. Three insurgent officers and 46 men surrender to Colonel Liscum at Tarlac, Luzon, P. I.
27. Major Langhorne with a detachment Thirty-ninth Infantry in a skirmish with insurgents at Camalig, Luzon, P. I., kills 4 insurgents, and wounds many more. A force of 100 insurgents, in an attack on Abcay, Bataan, Luzon, P. I., are repulsed by Captain Brandt, Thirty-second Volunteers, killing 4 insurgents. No casualties to United States forces. Three insurgent officers and 55 soldiers surrender unconditionally to Lieutenant-Colonel Bubb, Twelfth Infantry, at Paniqui, Luzon, P. I. Action near Santiago, P. I., between insurgents under Captain Legaspi and detachment Forty-eighth Infantry, in which 1 insurgent is killed and 1 rifle and 90 cartridges captured. Action at Tulao, P. I., between native scouts and insurgents, and 2 rifles and 26 cartridges are captured.
28. The Barrio of Pawan near Pagsanjan, province of Laguna, P. I., surrenders to and is destroyed by detachments Forty-second Infantry, Thirty-seventh Infantry, and Eleventh Cavalry. Loss to insurgents 1 killed, 1 wounded, and 4 captured. No casualties to United States troops. Detachment Thirty-sixth Infantry captures near Mangatarem, P. I., 13 guns and 1 pistol. Detachment Thirty-fourth Infantry captures at Licup, P. I., 18 rifles, 485 cartridges, and insurgent lieutenant.
29. Action near Penaranda, P. I., between mounted detachment Thirty-fifth Infantry and insurgents. Action near Agno, P. I., between detachment Thirty-sixth Infantry and insurgents results in the capture of 2 native cannon and 3 rifles. Action near Tarlac, P. I., between scouting party and insurgents results in capture of 5 carbines, 44 cartridges, 1 prisoner, and papers belonging to insurgent Lieutenant-Colonel Gilino.
30. Mounted detachment Thirty-sixth Infantry in fight during the night captures 27 Remington and 4 Mauser rifles, also Francisco Orden, chief of ladrones. Lieutenant Barnado Vacho and 11 men surrender at Cuyapo, P. I., to adjutant Twelfth Infantry with 4 Mauser and 2 Remington rifles and 100 cartridges. In action at Linalon, P. I., between detachment Forty-second Infantry and 250 insurgents 1 soldier and 8 insurgents are killed and 4 insurgents are wounded; Colonel Duvall, Forty-eighth Infantry, captures Francisco Perez, captain of bolo gang, near Santa Lucia, P. I.; Major Johnson, Twenty-ninth Infantry, island of Tablos, near Odinuan, encounters and captures a band of 25 insurgents with 10,000 rounds of ammunition and a deposito containing 20 tons of rice.
31. Captain Sullivan with detachment Thirty-fourth Infantry captures at Licup, P. I., 3 rifles, 3 shotguns, and 125 rounds of ammunition; Lieutenant O'Connell, commanding Macabebe scouts, at Cuyapo, P. I., captures near that place 7 rifles and 6 insurgents.
- June 1. Capt. Ambrosia Sandoval surrenders at Cuyapo, P. I., to United States forces, with 1 lieutenant, 20 men, 26 rifles, 4 revolvers, and 700 rounds of ammunition. Major Steever, with Troop E, Third Cavalry, struck insurgents in force at Mount Parayan, southeast of Badoc. Our losses, 1 man killed, 1 wounded. Twenty-seven insurgents seen to fall, 2 prisoners.
2. Three Remingtons, 1 Mauser, 2 revolvers, and ammunition are surrendered to Lieutenant Davis, Twelfth Infantry, at San Juan de Guimba, P. I.; 3 rifles are surrendered at Camalig, P. I., to Major Allen, Twelfth Infantry; Lieutenant Smith, Twenty-sixth Infantry, captures 3 Remingtons, 3 Mausers, and 1 shotgun in Barrio of Mangatarem, P. I.; Lieut. Mariano Quinson, with 10 men, surrender at Cuyapo, P. I.; Lieutenant Matson, Thirty-fourth Infantry, captures near Santo Domingo, P. I., 23 rifles without stocks, large quantity artillery ammunition and parts of ammunition factory; detachment Thirtieth Infantry captures at Unisan, P. I., the insurgent Maj. Antonio Marina.
3. In action near Bustos, P. I., an insurgent, reputed to be Captain Francisco Malabon Battalion, is killed.
4. Insurgent Captain Versola turns in 4 rifles at Cuyapo, P. I., and insurgent Lieutenant Quinson, same place, brings in 13 insurgents, rifles, and ammunition; 3 rifles are surrendered at Aguila, P. I.
5. Insurgent Captain Mendoza surrenders at Cuyapo, P. I.; 10 guns, 10 rifles, and 3 shotguns are surrendered to commanding officer, Camalig, P. I.

1900.
June 8. The insurgent General Pilar is arrested opposite San Pedro Macati, P. I., by Captain Lara, in command detachment Twenty-first Infantry; Lieut. Col. Manuel de Leru, with 1 captain, 2 lieutenants, 36 men, and 64 guns, surrender at Tarlac, P. I.; Captain Sullivan, Thirty-fourth Infantry, captures Col. Queripaito Medina and Oboldo Yango, near Mayapup, P. I.; and Lieut. Col. Valentine Diaz, of Macabulo's force, surrenders at Camalig, P. I.
9. Lieutenant Bolton, commanding detachment Seventeenth Infantry, captures near Alcala, P. I., Cavestany and Maj. Nicolas Perez, also 12 rifles and 1,000 rounds of ammunition.
10. Insurgent Maj. Ynocencio Catlas surrenders at Camalig, P. I.
11. Lieutenant Johnson, commanding detachment Forty-first Infantry, captures the insurgent General Hizon, near Molina of San Jose, vicinity of Mexico, P. I.; General Grant captures stronghold occupied by insurgents near Libut, P. I., destroying barracks and stone houses; Captain Hilton, Thirty-ninth Infantry, surrounds barrio of Sutil, a haunt of pirates, and arrests every male inhabitant, 70 in number.
12. Lieutenant Mapes, Thirty-second Infantry, captures in mountains near Porac, a large quantity of ordnance stores, including Mauser cartridge machine.
13. Lieutenant Harvey, Forty-first Infantry, captures at Magalang, P. I., 5 insurgents, 5 rifles, and considerable ammunition; Major Braden, Thirty-sixth Infantry, secures 2 rifles at Mangatarem, P. I., and Lieutenant Smith, Thirty-sixth Infantry, captures 17 rifles near same place.
15. Major Steever, northeast of Cabugar, P. I., and southeast of Sinait, P. I., in several skirmishes with insurgents, destroys 6 cuartels, 4 outpost stations, and number of isolated shelters, also much clothing, and captures Tino's quarters (which are burned) and letters signed by him. Insurgent General Macabulos, with 8 officers, 154 men, and 124 guns, surrenders at Tarlac, P. I., to Colonel Liscum; Lieut. Genero Morelles surrenders at Camalig, P. I.; Maj. Mateo de la Cruz and Dionisio Loredo, secretary to Colonel Stana, are captured by detachment Forty-second Infantry during the night.
16. Detail Twenty-fourth Infantry, sent out on 15th instant, returns to San Jose, P. I., from mountains, bringing 120 Mauser and 85 Remington rifles found in cache and 13 bull-cart loads of machinery for making powder; Lieut. Catalino Alnas, with 10 men and 10 rifles, surrenders at Villasis, P. I.
17. Eight insurgents, with 9 Remington rifles and 1 revolver, surrender to Captain Crittenden, Twenty-second Infantry, at Candaba, P. I. Wagon train from Naic to Indang ambushed near Malabon and one civilian teamster killed.
20. Detachment Forty-first Infantry, near Barrio Panapan, P. I., in skirmish with ladrones, wounds one and captures considerable ammunition.
22. Lieutenant Burr, commanding detachment 15 scouts, encounters band of ladrones near Barrio Haciopis, P. I., killing 9 and capturing 2 wounded, 2 ponies, and quantity of ammunition. Captain Garviana surrenders at Cabanatuan, P. I., to United States forces.
23. Insurgent Lieut. Col. Cadore Calina, with 3 officers, 15 men, and 15 guns, surrenders at Tarlac, P. I.
23. Lieutenant Burr, Eleventh Infantry, with 23 scouts, finds and destroys in mountains west of Malabaca, P. I., stronghold and cache of 20 tons of ordnance stores, and machinery of all kinds, for manufacturing ordnance.
24. Captain Lyers, Thirty-seventh Infantry, and Captain Ross, Eleventh Cavalry, with 2 companies in action with 200 armed insurgents, near Luisiana, P. I., kill 4.
25. Detachments Eleventh Cavalry and Thirty-seventh Infantry, under Captain Scott, strike insurgent band south of San Antonio. Killed 2, wounded 2, captured 2 men, 2 rifles, 20 bolos; no casualties among our troops.
26. A patrol of ten men of the Thirty-fifth Infantry encounters band of armed natives near Barrio San Rita, killing 1, wounding 1, and scattering the rest; our casualties none.
29. Town of Baculan, 24 miles south of Taguig, raided by ladrones; natives, robbed of money, clothing, and cattle, resisted and had one wounded. Filipino General Aquino surrenders at Angeles, with 64 rifles and 1,122 rounds ammunition.
- July 1. Major Short, with detachments E and C, Thirty-fifth Infantry, captures insurgent Major Sinfrose, who commands all troops in that vicinity, with 15 guns. Lieutenant Jernigan, Thirty-fourth Infantry, strikes a band of outlaws near Talavera, P. I., and kills 14. Major Wygant, Twenty-fourth Infantry, captures an insurgent captain and 7 men near San Jose. Gen. Artemio Ricarte de Zibora, a prominent insurgent leader, captured at Manila. Lieutenant Walker, with Troop A, Third Cavalry, strikes the body of ladrones who had ambushed the Indang wagon train, killing 2.
2. A body of 50 ladrones secrete themselves on a coastwise vessel, the *Filipino*, at Manila, and when opposite Gotong seize and plunder the vessel. General Grant pursues and overtakes them on the 3d, killing 12 and dispersing remainder. Our loss, 3 killed and 2 wounded, all of Company H, Third Infantry.
3. First Sergt. E. L. Hamilton and 8 men, of Company E, Thirtieth Infantry, attacked by a body of some 50 insurgents at Damagueo bridge; attack successfully repulsed; 3 men wounded. In action with ladrones, near Humingan, P. I., detachment of Company A, Twenty-fourth Infantry, kills 1 and captures 5; also takes 8 Remington rifles and 200 cartridges.
4. Two insurgent officers and 20 men surrender at Magalang, P. I.

Summary showing the number of vessels in the United States Navy.

REGULAR NAVY. NO. 2.	
Wooden steam vessels unfit for sea service	11
Wooden sailing vessels unfit for sea service	6
Total number of vessels in Regular Navy	189
AUXILIARY NAVY.	
Merchant vessels converted into Auxiliary Cruisers	11
Converted yachts	28
Converted tugs	27
Steamers converted into colliers	19
Special class	17
Revenue cutters	15
Light-house tenders	4
United States Fish Commission	2
Total number of vessels in Auxiliary Navy	123
Grand total	312

List of prizes captured by vessels of the North Atlantic fleet.

Name of ship captured.	Armed or not.	Condemned, released, or destroyed.
Buena Ventura.....	Not.....	Condemned.
Pedro.....	do.....	Do.
Panama.....	Armed.....	Do.
Lorenzo.....	Not.....	Do.
Carlos F. Rozes.....	do.....	Do.
Almirante Oquendo.....	Armed.....	Do.
Infanta Maria Teresa.....	do.....	Captured and destroyed by the squadron off Santiago, July 3, 1898.
Vizcaya.....	do.....	
Cristobal Colon.....	do.....	
Pluton.....	do.....	
Furor.....	do.....	
Alvarado.....	do.....	Captured.
Reina de los Angeles.....	Not.....	Do.
Tomas Brooks.....	do.....	Do.
Mexico.....	do.....	Do.
San Juan.....	do.....	Do.
Mortero.....	do.....	Do.
Frasquita.....	do.....	Condemned.
Reina Mercedes.....	Armed.....	Beached.
Ambrosio Bolivar.....	Not.....	Condemned.
Guido.....	do.....	Do.
Almansa.....	do.....	Released.
Olinda Rodriguez.....	do.....	
Argonauta.....	do.....	Condemned.
Adula.....	do.....	Do.
Catalina.....	do.....	Released.
Candito.....	do.....	Condemned.
Sol.....	do.....	Released.
Don Francisco Gandon.....	do.....	Do.
Anita.....	do.....	Do.
Miguel Jover.....	do.....	
Quatro de Setiembre.....	do.....	Condemned.
Manati.....	do.....	
Gibara.....	do.....	
Expreso de Gibara.....	do.....	
Paquette.....	do.....	Do.
Alfonso XII.....	do.....	Destroyed.
Tres Hermanos.....	Not.....	Condemned.
A. Bolivar.....	do.....	Do.
Mascota.....	do.....	Do.
Lola.....	do.....	
Oriente.....	do.....	Do.
Fernandito.....	do.....	Do.
Amapala.....	do.....	Do.
Nipe.....	do.....	Released.
Carnieta.....	do.....	Abandoned.
Principe.....	do.....	Released.
Josephine.....	do.....	Destroyed.
Jose Pileri.....	do.....	Released.
Lalulula.....	do.....	Scuttled and abandoned.
Schooner Sofia.....	do.....	
Schooner Matilde.....	do.....	
Ciudad de Sagua.....	do.....	
Nabiero.....	do.....	Destroyed.
Pensamiento.....	do.....	Do.
S. F. 22.....	do.....	Do.
Freo Juanitas.....	do.....	Do.
Vivero Lorenzo.....	do.....	Do.
Blanco.....	do.....	Do.
Joven Genaro.....	do.....	Do.
Santiago Apostol.....	do.....	Condemned.
Newfoundland.....	do.....	
Franklin.....	do.....	
Iron lighter in tow of steamer Manita. Latter escaped.	do.....	Do.
Antonio Suarez.....	do.....	Do.
Bella Yula.....	do.....	Do.
Lafayette.....	do.....	Released.
Espana.....	do.....	Condemned.
Sloop Donna Ynez.....	Not.....	Not known.
Sloop Josefa.....	do.....	Destroyed off Cardenas.
Sloop Christina.....	do.....	Not known.
Galito.....	do.....	Condemned.
Santo Domingo.....	Armed.....	Case still in court.
Dolores.....	Not.....	Do.
Emmanuel Raoul.....	do.....	Disposition unknown.
Benito Estenger.....	do.....	Do.
E. B. Nickerson.....	do.....	Do.
Farragut.....	do.....	Do.
Salve Maria.....	do.....	Do.
Regulus.....	do.....	Lost on reef.
Tobasqueno.....	do.....	Waiting adjudication.
Aladdin.....	do.....	Released.
Rita.....	do.....	Do.
Twickenham.....	do.....	Condemned.
Wary.....	do.....	
Restormel.....	do.....	Cargo condemned.
Terror.....	Armed.....	Disabled and sunk.
No Name.....	Not.....	Condemned.
Ponto Maria.....	Armed.....	Destroyed.
Delgado Parejo.....	do.....	Do.
Cuba Espanola.....	do.....	Do.
Estrella.....	do.....	Do.
Guantanamo.....	do.....	Do.
Guardian.....	do.....	Do.
Purissima Concepcion.....	Not.....	Do.
Jose Garcia.....	do.....	Do.
Gloria.....	do.....	Do.
Luz.....	do.....	Do.
Jacinto.....	do.....	Do.
Mannolita.....	do.....	Do.
Arni tad.....	do.....	Do.
Neuesia.....	do.....	Do.
Marie.....	do.....	Do.
Burton.....	do.....	Released.
1 lighter.....	do.....	Do.
9 lighters.....	do.....	Do.
3 lighters.....	do.....	Do.

List of prizes captured by vessels of the North Atlantic fleet—Continued.

Name of ship captured.	Armed or not.	Condemned, released, or destroyed.
Greenan Castle.....	Not.....	
Manoubia.....	do.....	
Sugar lighters and sailing vessels in the port of Ponce.	do.....	
Humberto Rodriguez.....	do.....	Not acted upon.
San Fernando.....	do.....	Released.
Sad.....	do.....	Do.

Purchase of auxiliary vessels.

Name before purchase.	Renamed.	Purchase price.
Columbia.....	Wasp.....	\$95,000
Alicia.....	Hornet.....	117,500
Almy.....	Eagle.....	110,000
Hermione.....	Hawk.....	50,000
D. C. Evans.....	Nezinscot.....	30,000
P. H. Wise.....	Sionx.....	25,553
Winthrop.....	Oscola.....	100,000
El Toro.....	Accomac.....	40,000
Wilnot.....	Potomac.....	125,300
Edward Luckenback.....	Tecumseh.....	45,000
Walter A. Luckenback.....	Uncas.....	75,000
Atlas.....	Wompatuck.....	65,000
Josephine.....	Vixen.....	150,000
Mayflower.....	Mayflower.....	430,000
Sovereign.....	Scorpion.....	300,000
Creole.....	Solace.....	600,000
Diogenes.....	Topeka.....	170,327
(Not named).....	Manly.....	24,500
Do.....	Somers.....	72,997
Saturn.....	Saturn.....	200,000
Lebanon.....	Lebanon.....	225,000
El Norte.....	Yankee.....	575,000
El Rio.....	Dixie.....	575,000
El Sul.....	Prairie.....	575,000
El Sud.....	Yosemite.....	575,000
Nietheroy—El Cid.....	Buffalo.....	575,000
Amazonas.....	New Orleans.....	1,429,215
Almirante Abru.....	Albany.....	1,205,000
Merrimac.....	Merrimac.....	342,000
Niagara.....	Niagara.....	200,000
Sterling.....	Sterling.....	190,000
Enterprise.....	Modoc.....	30,000
No. 18.....	No. 18.....	2,800
Nanshan.....	Nanshan.....	155,728
Zafiro.....	Zafiro.....	87,597
Alice.....	Alice.....	19,000
C. G. Coyle.....	Choctaw.....	82,500
Penwood.....	Powhatan.....	42,500
Fearless.....	Iroquois.....	150,000
Vigilant.....	Vigilant.....	60,000
Active.....	Active.....	75,000
Hercules.....	Hercules.....	40,000
Southery.....	Southery.....	100,000
Venezuela.....	Panther.....	375,000
Yumuri.....	Badger.....	307,000
Yorktown.....	Resolute.....	475,000
T. P. Fowler.....	Mohawk.....	44,000
Thespia.....	Hist.....	65,000
Restless.....	Restless.....	29,000
Illawara.....	Oneida.....	60,000
Viking.....	Viking.....	30,000
Chatham.....	Vulcan.....	350,000
Penelope.....	Yankton.....	125,000
Right Arm.....	Pontiac.....	30,000
Philadelphia.....	Peoria.....	100,000
Corsair.....	Gloucester.....	225,000
Menemsha.....	Irus.....	145,000
John Dwight.....	Pawnee.....	25,000
Justin.....	Justin.....	145,000
Hortense.....	Takoma.....	28,000
Aileen.....	Aileen.....	55,000
Scindia.....	Scindia.....	207,657
Comanche.....	Frolic.....	115,000
Illinois.....	Supply.....	325,000
Kingstor.....	Cesar.....	175,194
Dorothea.....	Dorothea.....	187,500
Gov. Russell.....	Gov. Russell.....	71,000
East Boston.....	East Boston.....	57,500
W. H. Brown.....	Piscataqua.....	130,000
J. D. Jones.....	Apache.....	54,510
Celtic King.....	Celtic.....	340,900
Rhactia.....	Cassius.....	160,594
A. W. Booth.....	Massasoit.....	30,000
Joseph Holland.....	Hannibal.....	147,941
Atala.....	Alexander.....	206,826
Eliz. Holland.....	Leonidas.....	147,941
Harlech.....	Pompey.....	111,929
Abarenda.....	Abarenda.....	175,000
(Not known).....	Scipio.....	85,769
Peter Jelsben.....	Brutus.....	215,000
No. 55.....	Water Barge No. 1.....	24,000
Whitgift.....	Nero.....	215,000
Norse King.....	Rainbow.....	176,576
Enquirer.....	Enquirer.....	80,000
Inca.....	Inca.....	35,000
Huntress.....	Huntress.....	27,500
Stranger.....	Stranger.....	75,000
Kate Jones.....	Seminole.....	25,000
Bristol.....	Cheyenne.....	20,000
Eugenia.....	Siren.....	40,000
Elfrida.....	Elfrida.....	50,000
No. 235.....	Sylph.....	50,000

Purchase of auxiliary vessels—Continued.

Name before purchase.	Renamed.	Purchase price.
Shearwater	Shearwater	\$28,000
Sylvia	Sylvia	25,000
Hercules	Chickasaw	15,000
Confidence	Waban	20,000
Kanawha	Kanawha	50,000
Pedro	Hector	200,000
Port Chalmers	Glacier	340,550
Titania	Marcellus	90,000
Refrigerating ship		247,704
Lucilene	Arethusa	218,992

THE FIGHTING FORCE.

The number of enlisted men allowed by law prior to the outbreak of hostilities was 12,500. On August 15, when the enlisted force reached its maximum, there were 24,123 men in the service. This great increase was made necessary by the addition of 128 ships to the Navy. The maximum fighting force of the Navy, separated into classes, was as follows:

Battle ships (first class)	4
Battle ships (second class)	1
Armored cruisers	2
Coast defense monitors	6
Armored ram	1
Protected cruisers	12
Unprotected cruisers	3
Gunboats	18
Dynamite cruiser	1
Torpedo boats	11
Vessels of old Navy, including monitors	14
Auxiliary Navy:	
Auxiliary cruisers	11
Converted yachts	28
Revenue cutters	15
Light-house tenders	4
Converted tugs	27
Converted colliers	19
Miscellaneous	19

Captured in Spanish-American war.

Name.	Displacement.	Type.
	Tons.	
Alvarado	100	Steel gunboat.
Barcelo	66	Torpedo boat.
Callao	208	Steel gunboat.
Infanta Maria Teresa	7,000	Steel armored cruiser.
Leyte	151	Iron gunboat.
Manila	1,000	Iron transport.
Mindanao	83	Wooden gunboat.
Sandoval	100	Steel gunboat.

Merchant vessels converted into auxiliary cruisers.

Name.	Displacement.	Name.	Displacement.
	Tons.		Tons.
Badger	4,784	St. Louis	14,910
Buffalo	6,888	St. Paul	14,910
Dixie	6,114	Yale	13,000
Harvard	13,000	Yankee	6,888
Panther	4,280	Yosemite	6,179
Prairie	6,872		

Converted yachts.

Name.	Displacement.	Name.	Displacement.
	Tons.		Tons.
Aileen	192	Kanawha	175
Buccaneer	175	Mayflower	2,090
Dorothea	594	Oncida	150
Eagle	434	Restless	137
Elfrida	173	Scorpion	850
Enquirer	136	Shearwater	315
Free Lance	197	Siren	546
Frolic	607	Stranger	152
Gloucester	796	Sylph	302
Hawk	375	Sylvia	218
Hist	472	Viking	806
Hornet	425	Vixen	690
Huntress	81.76	Wasp	975
Inca		Yankton	

Converted tugs.

Name.	Displacement.	Name.	Displacement.
	Tons.		Tons.
Accomac	187	Pawnee	275
Active	290	Piscataqua	631
Alice	356	Pontiac	401
Apache	650	Potomac	677
Cheyenne		Powhatan	194
Chickasaw		Seminole	
Choctaw		Takoma	
Hercules	108	Sioux	155
Iroquois	702	Tecumseh	214
Massasoit	202.45	Uncas	441
Modoc	240.76	Vigilant	300
Mohawk	420	Waban	
Nemineco	156	Wompatuck	462
Oscoda	751		

Naval prisoners of war captured off Santiago July 3, 1898.

Officers	99
Enlisted men	1,675

Casualties in action.

Engagement.	Number of casualties.	Killed.	Wounded.	Died subsequently as result of wounds.
Action at Manila Bay, May 1	9		9	
Action off Cienfuegos, May 11	12	1	11	1
Action off Cardenas, May 11	8	5	3	
Action off San Juan, Porto Rico, May 12	8	1	7	
Engagements at Guantanamo, Cuba, June 11 to 20	22	*6	16	
Engagement off Santiago: June 22	10	1	9	
July 3	11	1	10	
Miscellaneous: Yankee, June 13	1		1	
Eagle, July 12	1		1	
Bancroft, August 2	1	1		
Amphitrite, August 7	1		1	†1
	84	16	68	2

* One accidentally killed.

† Accidentally shot.

Killed and wounded at Manila Bay, May 1, 1898, 381 officers and men.

Vessels destroyed and captured.

Ship.	Officers, etc.	Total complement.
Reina Christina	57	352
Castila	52	349
Don Juan de Austria	28	179
Don Antonio de Ulloa	31	159
Isla de Cuba	31	156
Isla de Luzon	31	156
Marquis del Duero	18	96
General Lezo	20	115
Argos	21	87
Velasco	28	147
Total		1,796

Casualties in Philippine Islands to August 31, 1898.

Killed:	
Officers	None.
Enlisted men	11
Wounded:	
Officers	12
Enlisted men	104
Total	127
Died from wounds received in action:	
Officers (Captain Richter)	1
Enlisted men	7

Summary showing the number of vessels in the United States Navy (Regular Navy).

First-class battle ships	12	Composite gunboats	6
Second-class battle ship	1	Training ship (Naval Academy)	1
Armored cruisers	2	Special class	2
Armored ram	1	Torpedo-boat destroyers	16
Double-turreted monitors	6	Steel torpedo boats	35
Steel single-turreted monitors	4	Submarine torpedo boat	1
Iron single-turret monitors	13	Wood torpedo boat	1
Protected cruisers	13	Captured in Spanish-American war	8
Protected cruisers sheathed with wood	2	Iron cruising vessels	5
Unprotected cruisers	3	Wooden cruising vessels	8
Gunboats	9	Sailing vessels	6
Light-draft gunboats	3	Tugs	14

ADJUTANT-GENERAL OF THE ARMY.

The Adjutant-General of the Army promulgates all orders of a military character of the President, the Secretary of War, and the Commanding General of the Army, and conducts the correspondence between the latter and the Army; receives reports and returns pertaining to the Army; prepares commissions, appointments, and acceptances of resignations for issuance, and, under the direction of the Secretary of War, has charge of the recruiting service.

ALASKA.

Superficial area 531,400 square miles, nearly equal to one-sixth of the whole United States and its Territories.

Discovered by Russian fur hunters a little over a century ago.

Acquired by the United States in May, 1867; purchase price, \$7,200,000.

Treaty negotiated on part of the United States by Hon. William H. Seward, Secretary of State.

Territory formally transferred at Sitka, October 18, 1867, by Prince Matutoff, acting for the Russian Government; received by General Rousseau, acting commissioner for the United States.

Chiefly valued at time of purchase for its furs and fisheries.

Population, 1880: Natives, 32,900; whites, 430. Total population 1880, 33,330.

Annual yield of furs (estimated 1880), \$2,181,832.

Trans-Alaskan military route 200 miles shorter than either the Skagway, White Pass, Dyea, or Chilkoot routes.

Yukon River the largest river on the North American continent.

Gold discovered in the Upper Yukon Valley in the fall of 1896.

All-American route discovered and explored in the summer of 1898.

Most valuable timber located on the coast range washed by the Japan current. Temperature of southern coast, minimum, zero; beyond coast range summer, as high as 110° F.; winter average 15° below.

Auriferous indications found in almost all streams having their inception in the Tanana hills; also at the head waters of the Tanana and in and on the several tributaries of that stream; also in the Mount McKinley range, and in almost every creek and river flowing to the Copper and Shushitna valleys. Promising argentiferous quartz deposits found in the mountains at the head waters of the Copper River.

Coal deposits of great commercial value found in large quantities in the Copper River valley and on shores of Cook Inlet.

Valuable iron deposits believed to exist adjacent to the coal beds above mentioned; main range of mountains rich in copper ore.

Cape Nome placer deposits discovered in 1898.

Military Department of Alaska created January 19, 1900, and Col. George M. Randall assigned to the command of the Department.

Number of troops stationed in Alaska in August, 1900, 900; number of military posts, 8.

Location of military posts: Cape Nome, Circle City, Fort Egbert, Eagle City; Fort Gibbon, Tanana; Port Valdez, Rampart City, Skagway; and Fort St. Michael, St. Michael's Island.

Military explorations: First serious step taken to explore the interior of Alaska by the United States instituted by War Department in 1869, when Capt. Charles P. Raymond, Engineer Corps, ascended the Yukon River to Fort Yukon, and by scientific observations decided that the above-named point was in United States instead of British territory.

Subsequent expeditions: Maj. Gen. O. O. Howard, 1875; to redress grievances of coast Indians.

Lieut. Frederick Schwatka, 1883, to ascertain numerical strength and peaceful tendencies of natives, arms at their command, and power to cope with United States troops in case of war, and physical characteristics of country traversed.

Lieut. P. Henry Ray, 1884, expedition to Point Barrow to make scientific observations.

Lieut. W. R. Abercrombie, 1884, expedition into Copper River Valley to learn manner in which natives were subdivided into tribes and clans; also something of the character of country inhabited; feeling toward United States Government; modes of life of natives, their means of communication from one part of the country to the other; character of arms in their possession; native grasses grown in country traversed, and to obtain such other information as would prove of value to the Government from a military standpoint.

Lieut. Henry T. Allen, 1885, expedition to explore Copper River Valley for the purpose of making scientific observations on country traversed; to observe peaceful disposition of natives; their numerical strength for war; their habits, and to bring back material for maps of the country traveled over.

Capt. P. H. Ray, 1897, expedition for relief of destitute miners in the Klondike gold fields, and to aid in maintaining order whenever the same became necessary.

Capt. P. H. Ray, 1898, expedition for the relief of the destitute in the Yukon region.

Capt. W. R. Abercrombie, 1898, expedition into the Copper River Valley to take note of mineral resources of same; to note character of country traversed; to observe characteristics of tribes encountered; to make note of the agricultural resources of the Copper River Valley, its timber supply, insect life, fish, game; to select sites for military posts, and to ascertain and establish feasible railroad routes and routes of travel from Fort Valdez to the Tanana and Forty-mile districts.

Capt. E. F. Glenn, 1898, expedition to discover the most direct and practicable route from tide water to one or more crossings of the Tanana River in the direction of the Yukon; to observe topographical features, available routes of travel, feasible routes for railroad construction, to establish available sites for military posts, and to map and photograph country traveled over.

Capt. W. P. Richardson, 1899, exploration of the Yukon River to note climate; to observe topography of country; to note agricultural resources and minerals; to observe and report on species of game in country traversed, customs and habits of the natives, and to observe and report on such other matters as would add to the general knowledge of the country.

Capt. E. F. Glenn, 1899, to explore Cook Inlet, and especially to explore, survey, establish, and mark a trail from Portage Bay, Prince William Sound, to Knik Arm; to observe topographical features of country, available routes of travel, and feasible routes for railroad construction; to select available sites for military reservations, and to note the adaptability of the country traversed for agriculture and stock raising; also its mineral resources, timber, food products, fuel, etc.

Capt. W. R. Abercrombie, 1899, exploration of the Copper River Valley. To open up a trans-Alaskan military road from Port Valdez to Copper Center, and from thence by the most practicable route to Eagle City. To furnish valuable information in regard to the country traversed; to report available route of travel, feasible route for railroad construction, adaptability of country for agriculture and stockraising; to note mineral resources of country traversed, its timber, fuel, food products, its fish industries; to locate practicable crossings of the upper waters of the Copper and Tanana rivers; to note depth of water, width of streams, and conditions for fording same; to survey and triangulate passes over glaciers and through mountains; to plat full and complete figures of distance, altitudes and widths of passes, and to definitely locate and properly mark the same in order that they might be declared a military road by the Secretary of War.

Arms and ammunition captured at Santiago.

ARMS.	
Mausers rifles, Spanish, 7 mm.	16,902
Mausers rifles, Argentine, 7 mm.	872
Remington rifles, 7 mm.	6,118
Total rifles	23,892
Mausers carbines, Spanish, 7 mm.	833
Mausers carbines, Argentine, 7 mm.	84
Remington carbines, 7 mm.	530
Total carbines	1,447
Revolvers	75
AMMUNITION.	
Mausers—Spanish—cartridges, 7 mm.	1,500,000
Mausers—Argentine—cartridges, 7 mm.	1,471,200
Remington cartridges, 7 mm.	1,680,000
Total	4,651,200
Nine hundred and seventy-three thousand Remington cartridges, 7 mm., worthless.	

ARMY.

The joint resolution approved April 20, 1898, demanding that Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, authorized the President to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry the resolve into effect. Congress followed this step by the passage of an act, approved April 22, 1898, providing for the temporary increase of the military establishment of the United States.

By this law the organized and active land forces were declared to consist of the Regular Army and of the militia of the several States when called into service, constituting two branches, designated, respectively, as the Regular Army and the Volunteer Army of the United States. And the President was authorized to organize the regular and volunteer troops into divisions of three brigades, each brigade to be composed of three or more regiments, and when three or more divisions are present in the same army, to organize them into army corps, each corps to consist of not more than three divisions.

Under the authority conferred upon him by the joint resolution of April 20 and the act of April 22, 1898, the President issued a proclamation, dated April 23, 1898, calling for volunteers to the number of 125,000 men, to be apportioned as far as practicable among the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, according to population, to serve for two years unless sooner discharged. Among the several arms of the service the troops were apportioned as follows: Five regiments and 17 troops of cavalry, 16 batteries of light artillery, 1 regiment and 7 batteries of heavy artillery, 119 regiments and 10 battalions of infantry.

May 25, 1898, the President issued a proclamation calling for an additional force of 75,000 men. For controlling military reasons, it was determined to utilize so much of this additional force as was necessary to bring up the several State organizations in service to the full legal strength, the remainder to be apportioned among the several States and Territories according to their respective quotas as nearly as possible. The apportionment to the several arms of service under this second call was for 16 batteries of light artillery, 3 battalions of heavy artillery, and 22 regiments, ten battalions, and 46 companies of infantry.

ARMY CORPS BADGES.

When the land forces of the United States are organized into army corps, divisions, and brigades, the same will be designated by the following symbols, flags and pennants, and badges, made according to description and designs in the office of the Quartermaster-General:

SYMBOLS.

Cavalry Corps, a winged horsefoot.
 Artillery Corps, crossed conical projectiles, with round shot above center.
 First Corps, a circle over the letter "I," of special design.
 Second Corps, a four-leaf clover.
 Third Corps, a three-tooth clutch.
 Fourth Corps, a caltrop.
 Fifth Corps, a five-bastion fort.
 Sixth Corps, a 6-spoke hub.
 Seventh Corps, a 7-pointed star.
 Eighth Corps, two circles overlapping each other, one-third radius, resembling the figure "8."
 Ninth Corps, a buzzsaw with 9 teeth.
 Tenth Corps, two triangles, point to point, resembling the letter "X."
 Eleventh Corps, badge of Tenth Corps, with horizontal bar through center, representing "XI."
 Twelfth Corps, a square with clover leaf at each corner, thereby showing 12 small circles.
 Thirteenth Corps, a palm leaf with 13 spikes.
 Fourteenth Corps, a square with half circles on each side.
 Fifteenth Corps, a bugle.
 Sixteenth Corps, a spearhead.
 Seventeenth Corps, a battle-ax.
 Eighteenth Corps, an arch.
 The divisions of the corps will be represented by the color of the symbol as follows:
 First Division, red.
 Second Division, white.
 Third Division, blue.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS AND THEIR COMMUTATION.

Under the provisions of law relating to artificial limbs there were furnished during the year ended June 30, 1899, 27 artificial legs, 4 arms, 1 foot, and 1 apparatus for excision. Commutation certificates were issued for 105 cases of amputated leg, 70 of amputated arm, 12 of amputated foot, and for 1,934 cases of loss of the use of a limb. These cases involved an expenditure of \$125,088.91 from the appropriations available.

These benefits to disabled soldiers recur under existing laws every three years, so that the cases which matured and were paid during the year ended June 30, 1898, will again come up for payment if the beneficiaries are alive during the year ending June 30, 1901. There were in the files of the office 3,580 cases which matured during the fiscal year 1898. The commutation value of these cases was \$182,755. Allowing for deaths during the past three years, I estimate that there will be 3,400 claims presented during the year ending June 30, 1901, and that the sum of \$173,000 will be required to settle them. Estimates have already been submitted for this sum.

APPLIANCES FOR DISABLED SOLDIERS.

During the past year the sum of \$1,300.89 was expended for 149 appliances issued to disabled soldiers.

TRUSSES.

The number of trusses issued and fitted during the year was 1,068.

ARTILLERY.

12 batteries of heavy artillery, 113 enlisted men each	1,356
2 batteries of field artillery, 162 enlisted men each	324
Regimental noncommissioned staff	2
Regimental band	28

Total number of enlisted men in regiment	1,710
Number of regiments	7

Total number of enlisted men in artillery	11,960
---	--------

Each battery of heavy artillery shall consist of—

First sergeant	1
Quartermaster-sergeant	1
Sergeants	4
Corporals	12
Musicians	2
Mechanics	2
Cooks	2
Privates	85
Total	113

Each battery of field artillery shall consist of—

First sergeant	1
Stable sergeant	1
Quartermaster sergeant	1
Sergeants	6
Corporals	12
Artificers	4
Musicians	2
Cooks	2
Privates	133
Total	162

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR.

Under the law providing for the appointment of the Assistant Secretary of War, it is provided that that official shall perform such duties in the Department of War as shall be prescribed by the Secretary or may be required by law.

From time to time there have been delegated to the Assistant Secretary of War certain classes of business, and during the present Administration he has had jurisdiction over all matters relating to the volunteer forces of the United States in the civil war, questions relating to the enlisted personnel of the Army, the civil personnel of the War Department, and numerous other miscellaneous classes of business.

Battles and engagements in Cuba:

Las Guasimas, June 24, 1898.

El Caney, July 1, 1898.

San Juan, July 1-3, 1898.

Around Santiago, July 10-12, 1898.

Battles and engagements in Porto Rico:

Guánica, July 25, 1898.

Yauco, July 26, 1898.

Guayama, August 8, 1898.

Coamo, August 8-12, 1898.

Mayaguez, August 10, 1898.

Las Marias, August 13, 1898.

CAMPS.

Name and location of temporary camps, etc., established during the war with Spain, 1898.

Camp.	Location.
Adams, Alva	Denver, Colo.
Alger	Chickamauga Park, Ga.
Do	Near Dunn Loring, Va.
Alva Adams	Denver, Colo.
Alvin Saunders	Lincoln, Nebr.
Atkinson	Atlanta, Ga.
Do	Charleston, W. Va.
Bacon	Walker, Minn.
Ball, Tom	Houston, Tex.
Barret	Fruitvale, Cal.
Battery Point	Delaware City, Del.
Black	Hempstead, N. Y.
Boynton	Chickamauga Park, Ga.
Briggs	Fargo, N. Dak.
Brooke	Newport News, Va.
Burdette	Near Fort Preble, Me.
Bushnell	Columbus, Ohio.
Caffery	Covington, La.
Capron, Allyn	Fort Thomas, Ky.
Do	Puerto Principe, Cuba.
Carpenter	Do
Churchman	Albany, Ga.
Clark	Mobile, Ala.
Collier	Lexington, Ky.
Columbia	Habana, Cuba.
Conrad	Columbus, Ga.
Corbin, H. C.	Lexington, Ky.
Do	New Orleans, La.
Do	Richmond, Va.
Cuba Libre	Jacksonville, Fla.
Dan Russell	Raleigh, N. C.
Dewey	South Framingham, Mass.
Dewey, George	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
Dewey	Philippine Islands.
Dodge	Little Rock, Ark.
Dyer	Augusta, Ga.
Do	Near East Greenwich, R. I.
Eaton	Island Lake, Mich.
Fontana Barracks	San Francisco, Cal.
Formance	Macon, Ga.
Do	Columbia, S. C.
Forse	Huntsville, Ala.
Frank	Ardmore, Ind. T.
Gibbs, J. B., General Hospital	Lexington, Ky.
Gilman	Americus, Ga.
Graham	Tybee Island, Ga.
Hamilton	Lexington, Ky.
Do	Columbia, Tenn.
Hardin	Sand Lake, N. Y.
Harvey	Milwaukee, Wis.
Haskell	Athens, Ga.
Do	Macon, Ga.
Hastings	Mount Gretna, Pa.
Haven	Niantic, Conn.
Hawley	Galveston, Tex.
Henry, Patrick	Jackson, Miss.
Herbert, Hilary A.	Montgomery, Ala.
Hobson	Lithia Springs, Ga.
Hughes	Philippine Islands.
Johnston	Mobile, Ala.
Josiah Simpson General Hospital	Near Fort Monroe, Va.
Kent	Fort Douglas, Utah.
Lawton	Guantanamo, Cuba.
Lee	Richmond, Va.
Leedy	Topeka, Kans.
Leiter United States General Hospital	Chickamauga, Ga.
Marion	Summersville, S. C.
Mackenzie	Augusta, Ga.
McKinley	Des Moines, Iowa.
Do	Honolulu, H. I.

Name and location of temporary camps, etc.—Continued.

Camp.	Location.
Meade	Middletown, Pa.
Meiklejohn	Omaha, Nebr.
Merriam	Presidio, Cal.
Merritt	Do.
Miller	Do.
Mill Farm	Lexington, Ky.
Mosby	San Antonio, Tex.
Mount	Indianapolis, Ind.
Mueller	New Ulm, Minn.
Northern	Griffin, Ga.
Olympia	Burlington, Vt.
Onward	Savannah, Ga.
Otis	Honolulu, H. I.
Panama Park	Jacksonville, Fla.
Patrick Henry	Jackson, Miss.
Plume, Joseph W.	Buffalo, N. Y.
Poland	Knoxville, Tenn.
Powers	Augusta, Me.
Price	Macon, Ga.
Prior	Near Macon, Ga.
Ramsey	Near St. Paul, Minn.
Russell, Dan	Raleigh, N. C.
Rodgers	Ybor City, Fla.
Sadler	Carson City, Nev.
Sanger	Lexington, Ky.
Saunders, Alvin	Lincoln, Nebr.
Shipp	Anniston, Ala.
Simpson, Josiah, General Hospital	Near Fort Monroe, Va.
Snyder	Gettysburg, Pa.
Stephens	Jefferson Barracks, Mo.
Sternberg General Hospital	Chickamauga, Ga.
Stevenson	Boise City, Idaho.
Tanner	Springfield, Ill.
Taylor, Bob	Knoxville, Tenn.
Thomas	Chickamauga Park, Ga.
Townsend	Peekskill, N. Y.
Tunnell	Middletown, Del.
Voorhees	Sea Girt, N. J.
Wetherill	Fort Thomas, Ky.
Do	Greenville, S. C.
Wheeler	Huntsville, Ala.
Wikoff	Montauk Point, N. Y.
Wilder	Knoxville, Tenn.
Wilmer	Pimlico, Md.
Young, S. B. M.	Augusta, Ga.

Location and name of temporary camps, etc., established during the war with Spain, 1898.

Location.	Camp.
Albany, Ga.	Churchman.
Americus, Ga.	Gilman.
Anniston, Ala.	Shipp.
Ardmore, Ind. T.	Frank.
Athens, Ga.	Haskell.
Atlanta, Ga.	Atkinson.
Augusta, Ga.	Dyer.
Do	Mackenzie.
Do	S. B. M. Young.
Augusta, Me.	Powers.
Boise City, Idaho	Stevenson.
Buffalo, N. Y.	Joseph W. Plume.
Burlington, Vt.	Olympia.
Carson City, Nev.	Sadler.
Charleston, W. Va.	Atkinson.
Chickamauga Park, Ga.	Alger.
Do	Boynton.
Do	Thomas.
Do	Leiter U. S. General Hos-
Do	pital.
Columbia, S. C.	Sternberg U. S. General
Columbia, Tenn.	Hospital.
Columbus, Ga.	Formance.
Columbus, Ohio	Hamilton.
Covington, La.	Conrad.
Delaware City, Del.	Bushnell.
Denver, Colo.	Caffery.
Des Moines, Iowa	Battery Point.
Douglas, Fort, Utah	Alva Adams.
Douglas, Wis.	McKinley.
Dunn Loring, Va.	Kent.
East Greenwich, R. I.	Douglas.
Falls Church, Va.	Alger.
Fargo, N. Dak.	Dyer.
Fruitvale, Cal.	Alger.
Galveston, Texas.	Briggs.
Gettysburg, Pa.	Barrett.
Greenville, S. C.	Hawley.
Griffin, Ga.	Snyder.
Guantanamo, Cuba	Wetherill.
Habana, Cuba	Northern.
Hempstead, N. Y.	Lawton.
Honolulu, H. I.	Columbia.
Do	Black.
Houston, Tex.	Otis.
Huntsville, Ala.	McKinley.
Do	Tom Ball.
Indianapolis, Ind.	Forse.
Island Lake, Mich.	Wheeler.
Jackson, Miss.	Mount.
Jacksonville, Fla.	Eaton.
Do	Patrick Henry.
	Cuba Libre.
	Panama Park.

Location and name of temporary camps, etc.—Continued.

Location.	Camp.
Jefferson Barracks, Mo.	Stephens.
Knoxville, Tenn.	Poland.
Do	Bob Taylor.
Do	Wilder.
La Union, Cuba	Turman.
Lexington, Ky.	Collier.
Do	J. B. Gibbs General Hospital.
Do	Corbin.
Do	Hamilton.
Do	Mill Farm.
Do	Sanger.
Do	Young.
Lincoln, Nebr.	Alvin Saunders.
Lithia Springs, Ga.	Hobson.
Little Rock, Ark.	Dodge.
Macon, Ga.	Fornance.
Do	Haskell.
Do	Price.
Macon, Ga. (near)	Prior.
Manila, P. I.	Dewey.
Do	Hughes.
Matanzas, Cuba	Michie.
Middletown, Del.	Tunnell.
Middletown, Pa.	Meade.
Milwaukee, Wis.	Harvey.
Mobile, Ala.	Clark.
Do	Johnston.
Monroe, Fort, Va. (near)	Joshua Simpson General Hospital.
Montauk Point, N. Y.	Wilcox.
Montgomery, Ala.	Hilary A. Herbert.
Mount Gretna, Pa.	Hastings.
Niantic, Conn.	Haven.
New Orleans, La.	Corbin.
Newport News, Va.	Brooke.
New Ulm, Minn.	Mueller.
Omaha, Nebr.	Meiklejohn.
Peekskill, N. Y.	Townsend.
Pimlico, Md.	Wilmer.
Preble, Fort, Me.	Burdette.
Presido, San Francisco, Cal.	Merriam.
Do	Merritt.
Do	Miller.
Puerto Principe, Cuba	Allyn Capron.
Do	Carpenter.
Raleigh, N. C.	Dan Russell.
Richmond, Va.	Corbin.
Do	Lee.
San Antonio, Tex.	Mosby.
Sand Lake, N. Y.	Hardin.
San Francisco, Cal.	Fontana Barracks.
Savannah, Ga.	Onward.
Sea Girt, N. J.	Voorhees.
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	George Dewey.
South Framingham, Mass.	Dewey.
Springfield, Ill.	Tanner.
Summerville, S. C.	Marion.
St. Paul, Minn.	Ramsey.
Thomas, Fort, Ky.	Capron.
Do	Wetherill.
Topeka, Kans.	Leedy.
Tybee Island, Ga.	Graham.
Walker, Minn.	Bacon.
Ybor City, Fla.	Rodgers.

CASUALTIES IN ACTION.

In Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines between May 1, 1898, and June 30, 1899.

	Killed.		Wounded.		Died of wounds.		Died of disease.	
	Offi-cers.	Enlisted men.	Offi-cers.	Enlisted men.	Offi-cers.	Enlisted men.	Offi-cers.	Enlisted men.
Cuba	21	223	101	1,344	10	64	34	888
Porto Rico		4		36		8	4	251
Philippines	16	219	92	1,349	10	82	11	369

Grand total, 5,130.

Casualties in Fifth Army Corps in campaign against Santiago, June 22, 1898, to July 17, 1898.

	Officers.	Enlisted men.
Killed	21	220
Wounded	101	1,344

At battle of Las Guasimas, June 24, 1898.

	Officers.	Enlisted men.
Killed	1	15
Wounded	6	43

At battle of El Caney, July 1, 1898.

	Officers.	Enlisted men.
Killed	4	77
Wounded	25	335

At Aguadores, July 1-2, 1898.

	Enlisted men.
Killed	2
Wounded	10

At battle of San Juan, July 1-3, 1898.

	Officers.	Enlisted men.
Killed	15	127
Wounded	69	945

Casualties around Santiago, July 10-12, 1898.

	Officers.	Enlisted men.
Killed	1	1
Wounded	1	11

Grand total of casualties in killed and wounded during the war with Spain.

Where.	Killed.		Wounded.	
	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Officers.	Enlisted men.
Cuba	23	237	99	1,332
Porto Rico		3	4	36
Manila		17	10	96
Total	23	257	113	1,464

The total deaths in the army of the Philippines for the ten months from the 1st of January, 1899, to the 1st of November, 1899—that is to say, for the entire period covered by the war with the insurgents—have been of those killed in battle and dying of wounds and other injuries, 477; those dying of disease, 366; making a total of 843.

The deaths from all causes (including casualties in action) in the whole Army, regulars and volunteers, for the fourteen months from May, 1898, to June, 1899, inclusive, were 6,619. This is equivalent to an annual rate of 31.03 per thousand of strength. The deaths from disease during the whole period were at an annual rate of but 25.68 per thousand. These were as follows:

Stations.	Number of deaths.	Rate per 1,000.
United States	3,577	23.81
Cuba	928	45.14
Porto Rico	238	38.15
Philippines	402	17.20

Deaths in the armies of the United States, by countries, between May 1, 1898, and June 30, 1899.

Country.	Killed.		Died of wounds.		Disease.		Accident.	
	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Officers.	Enlisted men.
REGULARS.								
United States	1	5	10	32	874	1	51	
Cuba	19	134	6	60	381		7	
Porto Rico				3	73		3	
Hawaiian Islands					10			
Philippine Islands	4	81	1	33	109		10	
At sea			1	11	77			
Total	24	270	7	114	1,524	1	72	
VOLUNTEERS.								
United States			1	87	2,836	3	111	
Cuba	3	39	10	16	457	2	12	
Porto Rico		3		1	157		5	
Hawaiian Islands					31		1	
Philippine Islands	14	146	3	67	215		6	
At sea				5	122		2	
Total	17	188	3	78	3,890	5	137	
Aggregate	38	458	10	192	5,344	6	209	

Deaths in the armies of the United States, by countries, etc.—Continued.

Country.	Drowned.		Suicide.		Murder or homicide.		Total.	
	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Officers.	Enlisted men.
REGULARS.								
United States.....	1	16		19		18	35	993
Cuba.....		7		5		6	32	650
Porto Rico.....		1		3		1	3	81
Hawaiian Islands.....		1						12
Philippine Islands.....		19	1	3		1	10	256
At sea.....	1	4		2			6	94
Total.....	2	48	1	32		26	86	2,086
VOLUNTEERS.								
United States.....		23	1	15		22	91	3,008
Cuba.....		4				3	21	525
Porto Rico.....		2		1		1	1	169
Hawaiian Islands.....								34
Philippine Islands.....	1	9		3			23	446
At sea.....		2		1			5	127
Total.....	1	40	1	20		26	141	4,309
Aggregate.....	3	88	2	52		52	224	6,395

Recapitulation of casualties in action in the armies of the United States between May 1, 1898, and June 30, 1899

Country.	Killed.		Wounded.		Total.		Aggregate.
	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Officers.	Enlisted men.	
REGULARS.							
Cuba.....	18	183	86	1,126	104	1,309	1,413
Porto Rico.....		1	2	15	2	16	18
United States.....	1	5		10	1	15	16
Philippines, to Aug. 13, 1898.....		7	1	25	1	32	33
Philippines, since Feb. 4, 1899.....	2	74	20	410	22	484	506
Total.....	21	270	109	1,586	130	1,856	1,986
VOLUNTEERS.							
Cuba.....	3	39	15	218	18	257	275
Porto Rico.....		3	2	21	2	24	26
Philippines, to Aug. 13, 1898.....		11	9	74	9	85	94
Philippines, since Feb. 4, 1899.....	14	135	62	865	76	1,000	1,076
Total.....	17	188	88	1,178	105	1,366	1,471
Grand total.....	38	458	197	2,764	235	3,222	3,457

CHIEF OF ENGINEERS.

The Chief of Engineers commands the Corps of Engineers, which is charged with all duties relating to construction and repair of fortifications, whether permanent or temporary; with torpedoes for coast defense; with all works of defense; with all military roads and bridges, and with such surveys as may be required for these objects, or the movement of armies in the field. It is also charged with the river and harbor improvements, with military and geographical explorations and surveys, with the survey of the lakes, and with any other engineer work specially assigned to the corps by acts of Congress or orders of the Secretary of War.

CHIEF OF ORDNANCE.

The Chief of Ordnance commands the Ordnance Department, the duties of which consist in providing, preserving, distributing, and accounting for every description of artillery, small arms, and all the munitions of war which may be required for the fortresses of the country, the armies in the field, and for the whole body of the militia of the Union. In these duties are comprised that of determining the general principles of construction and of prescribing in detail the models and forms of all military weapons employed in war. They comprise also the duty of prescribing the regulations for the proof and inspection of all these weapons, for maintaining uniformity and economy in their fabrication, for insuring their good quality, and for their preservation and distribution.

CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER.

The Chief Signal Officer is charged with the supervision of all military signal duties, and of books, papers, and devices connected therewith, including telegraph and telephone apparatus and the necessary meteorological instruments for use on target ranges and other military uses; the construction, repair, and operation of military telegraph lines, and the duty of collecting and transmitting information for the Army by telegraph or otherwise, and all other duties usually pertaining to military signaling.

CLOTHING AND EQUIPAGE.

Among the articles issued by the Department between May 1 and August 15, 1898, were about—

Blankets.....	546,300
Blouses.....	290,800
Pairs of trousers.....	523,200
Campaign hats.....	476,700
Canvas field uniforms.....	153,170
Pairs shoes.....	782,300
Pairs leggings.....	588,800
Dark blue flannel shirts.....	622,200
Undershirts.....	1,257,000

Pairs of drawers.....	1,210,680
Tents, exclusive of shelter tents.....	65,000
Halves of shelter tents.....	372,400
Axes.....	30,000
Camp kettles.....	34,300
Mess pans.....	58,600

Besides a multitude of minor articles.

Statement showing articles of clothing and equipage supplies furnished by the Quartermaster's Department from September 1, 1899, to June 30, 1900, for issue to the Army. This statement does not include issues to troops stationed in the United States, as the necessary data will not be available until depot reports called for shall have been received.

CLOTHING.

Articles.	Quantities.	Value.
Abdominal bands.....	78,000	\$16,200.00
Blankets, wool.....	65,000	213,200.00
Blouses:		
Lined.....	2,584	8,785.00
Unlined.....	43,657	116,127.62
Boots:		
Leather.....pairs..	1,980	6,454.80
Rubber.....do..	14,225	29,730.25
Brassards.....	5,113	511.30
Canvas fatigue coats.....	26,985	24,965.45
Canvas fatigue trousers.....pairs..	18,879	14,159.25
Caps, forage.....	2,534	1,875.16
Cap ornaments.....	35,328	3,532.80
Chevrons:		
Cloth.....pairs..	28,703	6,601.69
Gold lace.....do..	7	14.00
Khaki.....do..	102,746	23,631.58
Coats, dress.....	68	370.72
Collars, linen.....	123,613	4,944.52
Corps badges.....	40,000	1,200.00
Cravats.....	8,400	924.00
Drawers:		
Canton flannel.....pairs..	6,546	3,011.16
Jeans.....do..	205,626	82,519.02
Nankeen.....do..	127,000	35,560.00
Summer.....do..	204,636	55,219.02
Woolen.....do..	1,000	380.00
Field uniform coats, khaki.....	220,403	308,564.20
Field uniform trousers, khaki.....pairs..	349,716	391,681.92
Field uniform shoulder straps, extra.....	176,972	17,697.20
Gauntlets, leather.....pairs..	24,352	36,040.96
Gloves, Berlin.....do..	274,653	32,958.36
Hats, campaign.....	256,492	225,712.96
Hat cords.....	277,743	22,219.44
Hat letters.....	319,025	3,000.25
Hat numbers.....	602,375	6,023.75
Helmets:		
Cork.....	48,988	75,441.52
Untrimmed.....	40	37.20
Cavalry, complete.....	45	101.70
Leggings.....pairs..	382,253	191,116.00
Music pouches.....	2,032	7,621.00
Overalls.....pairs..	13,662	7,104.24
Overcoats, all kinds.....	3,382	32,865.86
Ponchos.....	44,500	55,180.00
Shirts:		
Chambray.....	246,519	106,063.17
Dark blue flannel.....	201,628	527,846.68
Gingham.....	14	4.78
Muslin.....	27,771	9,164.43
Studs.....	45,720	457.20
Shoes:		
Barrack.....pairs..	42,620	33,689.80
Black calfskin.....do..	109,872	267,563.52
Russet.....do..	459,215	532,236.45
Shoe dressing.....packages..	84,800	3,362.00
Slickers, common.....	978	1,779.96
Slickers:		
Pommel.....	2,220	4,706.40
Dressing.....pairs..	1,200	300.00
Stable frocks.....	13,124	7,218.20
Stockings:		
Cotton, light.....pairs..	1,247,600	62,380.00
Cotton, heavy.....do..	28,569	2,314.14
Woolen, light.....do..	173,500	38,170.00
Woolen, heavy.....do..	33,346	8,065.04
Summer coats.....	91,033	80,610.64
Summer trousers.....pairs..	97,836	75,333.12
Suspenders.....do..	1,841	349.79
Talismans, rubber.....	225	261.25
Trousers:		
Duck.....pairs..	22,213	22,213.00
Kersey, foot, made.....do..	50,004	121,509.72
Kersey, foot, unmade.....do..	600	978.00
Kersey, mounted, made.....do..	16,651	47,954.88
Kersey, mounted, unmade.....do..	1,394	2,871.64
Stripes.....do..	30,489	5,702.91
Undershirts:		
Cotton.....	372,552	81,061.44
Nankeen.....	239,177	69,953.10
Woolen.....	137,068	71,275.36
Waist belts.....	131,185	31,484.40
Buttons:		
Line.....	279,200	3,722.67
Staff.....	4,016	73.63
Bone.....	250	7.50
Button toggles.....	320,720	32.07
Cloth, D. B.....yards..	115	165.75
Flannel, blouse.....do..	40	38.80
Laces:		
Legging.....pairs..	35,000	102.08
Shoe, black.....do..	100,000	2,125.00
Shoe, russet.....do..	200,000	4,500.00
Total clothing and materials.....		4,181,369.72

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

125

Statement showing articles of clothing and equipage supplies furnished by the Quartermaster's Department from September 1, 1899, etc.—Continued.

EQUIPAGE.

Articles.	Quantities.	Value.
Axes.....	13,250	\$4,902.50
Ax helvies.....	40,208	3,626.82
Barrack bags.....	51,468	22,645.92
Bed sacks.....	42,500	19,975.00
Bed sheets.....	11,000	2,640.00
Bedsteads.....	3,700	9,813.60
Bedstead clamps and bolts.....	6,000	128.00
Books, all kinds.....	8,761	6,210.50
Brooms, corn.....	42,632	8,100.03
Brushes, scrubbing.....	28,562	2,284.96
Bunk bottoms.....	50	52.50
Bunting.....yards.....	75	14.12
Camp colors.....	156	468.00
Card holders.....	7,112	71.12
Chairs, barrack.....	10,092	8,080.68
Colors.....	78	4,504.00
Colors, belts.....	52	124.80
Colors, staffs.....	78	214.50
Company marking stamps.....	438	1,130.04
Cots.....	56,807	84,642.43
Cot covers.....	20,000	12,850.00
Cot sticks.....	10,000	220.00
Drums.....	1	4.62
Drumsticks.....pairs.....	50	17.50
Drumheads.....	48	26.88
Fifes.....	98	18.13
Flags:		
Garrison.....	20	490.80
Hospital, field.....	88	264.00
Hospital, general.....	36	162.00
Post.....	378	2,921.94
Storm.....	3,359	6,583.64
Guidons, ambulance.....	78	175.50
Hammocks.....	800	6,880.00
Hand litters.....	1,964	5,813.40
Hatchets.....	13,466	5,117.08
Hatchet helvies.....	31,632	948.96
Kettles, camp.....	8,556	1,796.76
Mattresses.....	5,895	7,663.50
Mattress covers.....	920	316.20
Mess pans.....	12,400	1,488.00
Mosquito bars.....	74,200	61,586.00
Mosquito headnets.....	46,400	16,240.00
Paper, petroleum.....pounds.....	13,000	325.00
Pick axes.....	11,120	2,668.80
Pickax helvies.....	22,274	2,004.84
Pillows.....	1,332	1,259.72
Pillowcases.....	23,328	1,866.24
Pillow sacks.....	39,000	5,460.00
Pots, iron.....	500	535.00
Naphthalene.....pounds.....	5,227	156.81
Shovels:		
Long.....	2,700	1,579.50
Short.....	7,888	4,338.40
Spades.....	5,888	2,882.58
Spade and shovel handles.....	300	39.59
Stencils.....	265	212.00
Tents:		
Common company.....	2,093	18,104.45
Conical company.....	5,754	162,320.34
Hospital company.....	685	27,728.80
Hospital flies, extra.....	650	5,206.50
Shelter, halves.....	46,600	81,132.00
Wall company.....	1,802	47,937.16
Wall flies, extra.....	600	2,520.00
Munson's.....	66	4,340.92
Pins:		
Large, extra.....	72,030	1,080.45
Small, extra.....	221,254	2,212.54
Shelter, extra.....	55,000	687.50
Iron, large, extra.....	15,200	1,748.00
Iron, small, extra.....	10,200	918.00
Poles:		
Common, extra.....	40	32.40
Conical, extra.....	550	374.00
Hospital, extra.....	1,800	5,888.00
Shelter, extra.....	41,000	3,288.00
Wall, extra.....	650	962.00
Wall upright, extra.....	3,800	1,862.00
Ferrules.....	5,250	127.50
Rings, conical.....	500	100.00
Lines.....	300	279.00
Chains.....	1,000	540.00
Slips.....	6,000	180.00
Straps.....	500	50.00
Spindles.....	500	14.80
Tripods.....	500	870.00
Trumpets.....	1,036	2,880.08
Trumpet cords.....	2,180	937.40
Trumpet crooks.....	1,278	575.10
Trumpet mouthpieces.....	268	42.88
Whistles.....	7,504	1,200.64
Total equipage.....		710,121.51

RECAPITULATION.

Clothing and materials.....	\$4,181,369.73
Equipage.....	710,121.51
Grand total.....	4,891,490.23

Statement showing articles of clothing and equipage issued to troops from May 1, 1898, to August 31, 1899, and value of same. This statement includes the principal articles only.

Articles.	Issued.	Value.
Bandages, abdominal.....	85,063	\$17,867.43
Blankets, woolen.....	600,525	2,245,785.00
Blouses, all kinds.....	577,301	2,020,563.50
Boots, rubber.....	12,958	27,082.22
Caps, forage.....	338,748	250,673.52
Canvas fatigue coats.....	189,440	197,017.60
Canvas fatigue trousers.....	232,659	239,393.10
Coats:		
Khaki and field.....	167,544	308,280.96
Summer.....	102,816	105,900.48
Drawers, all kinds.....	2,082,894	791,499.72
Gauntlets, buckskin.....	126,443	194,722.22
Gloves, Berlin.....	630,670	60,373.70
Hats:		
Campaign.....	764,235	649,599.75
Canvas.....	10,084	4,032.60
Southwester.....	13,320	3,596.40
Helmets, cork.....	140,770	181,563.30
Leggings.....	863,383	535,297.46
Mittens, wool.....	532	296.00
Overcoats, arctic.....	14,176	18,570.56
Overcoats.....	157,815	1,507,133.25
Pajamas.....	6,784	4,477.44
Ponchos.....	469,670	565,344.00
Shirts:		
Dark blue.....	1,018,016	1,142,608.96
Chambray and nankeen.....	282,565	98,897.75
Shoes:		
Barrack.....	147,384	120,854.88
Leather.....	1,325,709	2,784,114.90
Slickers.....	11,237	23,980.04
Stockings, cotton and wool.....	2,613,785	444,343.04
Suspenders.....	333,516	63,368.04
Trousers:		
Foot.....	705,004	1,748,409.32
Mounted.....	71,890	225,734.60
Khaki and field.....	311,721	481,292.19
Summer.....	96,621	78,263.01
Undershirts, cotton and wool.....	1,099,009	428,613.51
		17,500,342.06
Axes.....	33,379	10,681.28
Ax helvies.....	87,969	7,037.52
Bedsacks.....	82,008	42,644.16
Books, all kinds.....	83,196	76,340.32
Cots.....	90,722	136,063.00
Drums.....	1,565	7,230.30
Fifes.....	1,036	207.50
Hatchets.....	35,314	9,181.64
Hatchet helvies.....	61,086	1,221.92
Hammocks.....	49,820	44,339.80
Hand litters.....	3,808	11,538.24
Instruments, band (sets).....	161	144,000.00
Kettles, camp.....	35,538	7,818.36
Mess pans.....	61,696	6,203.52
Mosquito bars.....	178,877	182,454.54
Mosquito headnets.....	152,274	48,727.64
Pickaxes.....	26,586	5,848.92
Pickax helvies.....	37,340	2,987.20
Shovels, all kinds.....	30,863	16,048.76
Spades.....	19,219	10,186.07
Trumpets.....	5,088	15,060.48
Tents:		
Common.....	47,189	43,413.88
Conical.....	8,491	232,313.76
Hospital.....	6,693	185,797.68
Shelter halves.....	291,458	443,116.16
Wall.....	10,737	215,598.96
		1,907,021.61
		19,407,363.67

CLOTHING AND EQUIPAGE SUPPLIES.

There was available for this branch of the service, during the last fiscal year, the sum of \$4,080,947.50. From this amount the sum of \$23,597,508.10 was remitted to disbursing officers of the Department, and requisitions for \$100,105.60 issued on settlements made at Treasury of accounts and claims, leaving a balance on hand June 30, 1899, of \$10,383,333.89, which will be further drawn upon to meet obligations entered into prior to the close of the fiscal year.

COMMISSARY-GENERAL OF SUBSISTENCE.

The Commissary-General of Subsistence has administrative control of the Subsistence Department; the disbursement of its appropriations; the providing of rations and their issue to the Army; the purchase and distribution of articles authorized to be kept for sale to officers and enlisted men; the administrative examination of accounts of subsistence funds preliminary to their settlement by the proper accounting officers of the Treasury, and the examination and settlement of returns of subsistence supplies.

By direction of the President, May 7, 1898, seven army corps were constituted, embracing both the Regular and Volunteer branches of the Army.

And, on June 21, the forces comprising the Philippine expeditions were constituted an army corps to be known as the Eighth.

THE FIRST AND THIRD CORPS.

These corps were made up of the troops assembled in the provisional army at Camp George H. Thomas, Georgia, and were commanded by Maj. Gen. John R. Brooke from May 1 to July 23, when he relinquished command to Maj. Gen. James F. Wade, United States Army, who commanded the forces until July 31. From that date until August 2, when Maj. Gen. J. C. Breckinridge reported by assignment, Gen. Royal T. Frank was in command. General Breckinridge continued as the commander of the forces until August 14, on which date he left Chickamauga Park.

In July the First Division of the First Corps, under General Wilson, was detailed for duty in Porto Rico.

August 21-22 the Second and Third Divisions of that corps were sent to Lexington, Ky., and Knoxville, Tenn., respectively.

The Third Corps was transferred early in September to camps at Anniston, Ala.

The combined strength of the First and Third Corps on the last days of the months of May, June, July, and August, 1898, was as follows:

Month.	Officers.	Enlisted men.
May.....	2,254	42,237
June.....	2,211	52,574
July.....	1,700	43,856
August.....	1,582	39,816

THE FIRST CORPS.

This corps was made up of the troops assembled in the provisional army at Camp George H. Thomas, Chickamauga Park, and Major-General Brooke was assigned to command May 1, which he relinquished July 23. Gen. James F. Wade, U. S. V., commanded the corps from that date to July 31, when General Frank commanded the forces until the arrival of Major-General Breckinridge, August 2.

In July, 1898, the First Division of the corps, under General Wilson, was detailed for duty in Porto Rico.

General Breckinridge left Camp Thomas September 14, all of the troops having left, the Second and Third Divisions having been sent to camps at Lexington and Knoxville, respectively. He established his headquarters at Lexington. On October 20 Maj. Gen. James H. Wilson relieved General Breckinridge of command of the reorganized First Corps (see G. O., 163, 1898), and the troops were moved to camps in the South, General Wilson making his headquarters at Macon, Ga. (See report Inspector-General, 1898, pp. 44 et seq.)

By orders from the War Department dated December 30, General Wilson was ordered to prepare certain of his command, including his headquarters, for service in Cuba. He sailed from Savannah January 7, 1899, reported his arrival at Matanzas January 10, and the remainder of the corps, with the exception of those regiments mustered out of service, were during the latter part of December, 1898, and January, 1899, distributed in the Provinces of Matanzas and Santa Clara.

By General Orders, No. 8, January 16, 1899, the First Corps was discontinued, and the few troops remaining in the United States belonging thereto were assigned as separate brigades of the Second Army Corps.

The strength of the First Corps is included in the forces at Camp Thomas to September.

Its strength on the last days of the months following was:

Month.	Officers.	Enlisted men.
September, 1898.....	824	19,519
October, 1898.....	862	20,683
November, 1898.....	837	19,536
December, 1898.....	812	19,220

THE SECOND ARMY CORPS.

Commanded by Maj. Gen. William M. Graham, U. S. V., from date of organization to November 2, 1898, when Maj. Gen. Samuel B. M. Young, U. S. V., assumed command and continued until the corps was discontinued May 3, 1899.

The corps was organized at Camp Alger, near Falls Church, Va., but was removed during the months of August and September to Camp George H. Meade, near Middletown, Pa.

As the winter months approached camps were selected for the corps at various stations in the South, General Young making his headquarters at Augusta, Ga.

The strength of the corps for the last days of the months mentioned below was as follows:

Month.	Officers.	Enlisted men.
May, 1898.....	922	17,467
June, 1898.....	1,103	23,002
July, 1898.....	1,183	29,747
August, 1898.....	1,347	33,765
September, 1898.....	879	21,436
October, 1898.....	887	21,576
November, 1898.....	976	22,646
December, 1898.....	973	22,185
January, 1899.....	1,304	29,446
February, 1899.....	814	17,972
March, 1899.....	242	4,954
April, 1899.....	49	795

NOTE.—A complete history of the Second Corps can be gathered from the reports of Major-General Graham (1898) and Young (1899), which are printed.

THE THIRD CORPS.

This corps was made up of the troops assembled in the provisional army at Camp George H. Thomas, Chickamauga Park, and Maj. Gen. James F. Wade, U. S. V., assumed command May 26, 1898, and he, after the departure of Gen. John R. Brooke, July 23, also commanded the troops at Camp Thomas. On July 31 Major-General Wade relinquished the command of the troops assembled at Camp Thomas to Brig. Gen. Royal T. Frank. On August 2 Maj. Gen. J. C. Breckinridge, U. S. V., assumed command of Camp Thomas, and General Frank was placed in command of the Third Corps, by direction of the President, September 4.

The Third Corps was transferred early in September to the camps established at Anniston, Ala., and by the end of that month but a small detachment remained at Camp Thomas, Georgia. The corps was discontinued October 7, 1898 (see G. O. 163, 1898), but by the time the corps was fully under way for Anniston it had melted away to a very few regiments, the rest having been ordered home for muster out. The strength of the Third Corps is included in the forces at Camp Thomas to September. Its strength on the last day of that month was 300 officers and 8,076 men.

THE FOURTH CORPS.

By orders of the War Department, Maj. Gen. John J. Coppinger, U. S. V., was designated to command the corps, and he arrived at Mobile April 19, 1898, where the organization of the corps was begun.

June 2 the corps commenced the march to Tampa, Fla., and on June 20 the First Division changed station from camp near Mobile to Miami, Fla., and on June 27 the division was transferred to the Seventh Corps. Regular regiments of the corps then assembled at Tampa were embarked with General Shafter's expedition, and other troops which were left behind were absorbed. The troops that then remained to the corps were moved to Fernandina, Fla., commencing July 30.

On August 11, the corps having been ordered to Huntsville, Ala., the movement was begun, and as fast as transportation was provided the corps was centered about Huntsville.

General Coppinger having been retired from the Army, General Wheeler was designated to command the corps, and served with it from October 13 to December 3. Brig. Gen. A. K. Arnold commanded from December 14 to 20, when General Lawton was assigned to command, and remained from December 23 to 29, when the command devolved upon Brig. Gen. Royal T. Frank, the senior officer present, and the headquarters were removed to Anniston. The corps was discontinued January 16, 1899.

Month.	Officers.	Enlisted men.
May, 1898.....	442	7,689
June, 1898.....	969	21,736
July, 1898.....	625	14,019
August, 1898.....	534	12,009
September, 1898.....	329	6,616
October, 1898.....	733	16,797
November, 1898.....	689	16,470
December, 1898.....	545	13,337

The above table shows the strength of command on last days of months mentioned.

THE FIFTH ARMY CORPS.

Commanded by Maj. Gen. William R. Shafter, U. S. V.

This corps was organized at Tampa, Fla. On June 7, 1898, the corps embarked on transports for Santiago, Cuba, the fleet sailing June 14, with 834 officers and 16,154 men, and the troops commenced to disembark on June 22. On June 29, 1898, 8,000 men were sent to reinforce the expedition.

After the short but brilliant campaign, which resulted in the surrender of the city and Province of Santiago de Cuba, it was decided, owing to the prevalence of disease which infected the whole army there, to withdraw the troops that had been operating in Cuba. The repatriation of the United States troops was commenced August 7, and, excepting the sick in hospital, was completed by August 24, when General Shafter and his staff sailed for the United States. The corps was discontinued October 7, 1898.

The strength present on the last days of the months indicated was as follows:

Month.	Officers.	Enlisted Men.
May.....	1,061	16,482
June.....	1,107	17,041
July.....	1,272	22,610
August.....	1,109	20,761
September.....	218	5,136

THE SIXTH ARMY CORPS.

The Sixth Corps failed of organization, and General Wilson was assigned to the command of the First Division of the First Corps.

THE SEVENTH CORPS.

Maj. Gen. Fitzhugh Lee, U. S. V., assumed command May 26, 1899.

The corps was organized at Tampa, Fla. General Lee having been authorized to establish his headquarters at Jacksonville, Fla., the corps removed to that place May 31, with the exception of the First Division, which remained at Tampa.

A division, General Schwan's, of the Fourth Army Corps, at Mobile, Ala., was transferred June 20 to the camp at Miami, Fla., and on the 23d of the same month was designated as the First Division of the Seventh Army Corps. This division was subsequently (July 31) transferred from Miami to Jacksonville, Fla. On October 8, 1898, orders were issued by the War Department to move the corps to Savannah, after suitable camps were prepared; and subsequently, by General Orders 171, dated October 21, 1898, the corps was reorganized; and in General Orders 184, December 13, 1898, General Lee, commanding the Seventh Army Corps, was assigned to the immediate command of all the troops in the province of Habana, that order in a preceding paragraph announcing a military division to be known as the Division of Cuba under the command of Maj. Gen. John R. Brooke. General Lee arrived at Havana December 14, 1898, and during the months of December, 1898, and January, 1899, all of the Seventh Corps was embarked from Savannah on transports for Cuba, and distributed in the province of Habana.

The volunteer troops having been mustered out of service, by General Orders 87, May 3, 1899, "all the divisions thereof having been disbanded," the Seventh Army Corps was discontinued.

The following table shows the strength of the corps on the last days of the months mentioned:

Month.	Officers.	Enlisted men.
May, 1898.....	501	8,904
June, 1898.....	873	18,778
July, 1898.....	978	23,704
August, 1898.....	1,236	29,940
September, 1898.....	779	17,514
October, 1898.....	724	16,365
November, 1898.....	674	14,421
December, 1898.....	551	15,693
January, 1899.....	678	14,806
February, 1899.....	672	14,700
March, 1899.....	275	5,342

THE EIGHTH ARMY CORPS.

Commanded by Maj. Gen. Wesley Merritt, U. S. A., who sailed from San Francisco June 29, arrived at Manila July 25, 1898.

Maj. Gen. E. S. Otis, U. S. V., assumed command August 29, 1898. Headquarters of the corps, Manila, P. I.

This corps embraced the forces comprising the Philippine expeditions, the troops being concentrated at San Francisco and forwarded to Manila at different dates.

TROOPS SENT TO MANILA.

First.—Gen. T. M. Anderson. Sailed May 25 on the *Australia*, City of Peking and City of Sydney, and arrived June 30, 1898. First California, Second Oregon, battery California Artillery, and A, C, D, E, and F, Fourteenth Infantry. Total, 115 officers and 2,386 enlisted men.

Second.—Gen. F. V. Greene. Sailed June 15 on the *China*, *Zealandia*, *Colon*, and *Senator*, and arrived July 17, 1898. A and B, Utah Artillery, Tenth Pennsylvania, First Colorado, First Nebraska, A, B, E, and G, Eighteenth and Headquarters, D, E, F, and H, Twenty-third Infantry, and detachment United States Engineers. Total, 158 officers and 3,428 enlisted men.

Third.—Generals Merritt and MacArthur. General Merritt sailed June 29 on the *Newport*, and arrived July 25, 1898. General MacArthur sailed on June 27 on the *Indiana*, with the *Morgan City*, *Ohio*, *Valencia*, and *City of Para*, and arrived July 31, 1898. First North Dakota, Thirtieth Minnesota, First Idaho, First Wyoming, Astor Battery, C, D, F, and H, Eighteenth United States Infantry, headquarters, band, B, C, G, and L, Twenty-third United States Infantry, G, H, K, and L, Third United States Artillery, Company A, Signal Corps Volunteers, and Company A, Engineer Battalion, U. S. A. Total, 197 officers and 4,650 enlisted men.

Fourth.—Gen. E. S. Otis. Sailed July 15 on *City of Peru* and *City of Pueblo*, and arrived August 21, 1898. C, E, G, I, K, and L, Fourth Cavalry, D and G, Sixth Artillery, headquarters, G, I, K, L, and M, Fourteenth Infantry, and detachment of recruits. Total, 42 officers and 1,640 enlisted men.

Fifth.—Col. H. C. Kessler, First Montana. Sailed July 19 on the *Pennsylvania*, and arrived August 24, 1898. First Montana. Total, 54 officers and 1,394 enlisted men.

Sixth.—Gen. H. G. Otis. Sailed July 23 on the *City of Rio Janeiro* and arrived August 24, 1898. A, C, D, E, F, G, L, and M, First South Dakota, and recruits. Total, 48 officers and 874 enlisted men.

Seventh.—Lieut. Col. Lee Stover, First South Dakota. Sailed July 29 on the *St. Paul*, and arrived August 31, 1898. B, H, I, and K, First South Dakota, and recruits. Total, 26 officers and 784 enlisted men.

Eighth.—Brig. Gen. Charles King. Sailed August 21 on the *Arizona*, and arrived at Honolulu August 27, 1898. Sailed from there November 10 and arrived at Manila November 25, 1898. Battalion (I, K, L, M) Eighteenth Infantry, and detachments First Nebraska, Tenth Pennsylvania, and First Colorado. Total, 18 officers and 1,006 enlisted men.

Ninth.—Maj. G. A. Goodale, Twenty-third Infantry. Sailed October 17 on the *Senator*, and arrived November 21, 1898. A, I, K, and M, Twenty-third United States Infantry, D, California Artillery, and detachment recruits for Second Oregon. Total, 16 officers and 778 enlisted men.

Tenth.—Lieut. Col. W. J. Fife, First Washington Volunteers. Sailed October 19 on the *Valencia*, and arrived November 21, 1898. F, G, I, and L, First Washington Infantry, and part of battalion California Artillery. Total, 17 officers and 484 enlisted men.

Eleventh.—Col. F. Funston, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers. Sailed October 27 on the *Indiana*, and arrived December 1, 1898. Headquarters and band, C, D, E, G, H, I, K, and M, Twentieth Kansas. Total, 31 officers and 725 enlisted men.

Twelfth.—Col. J. H. Wholley, First Washington Volunteers. Sailed October 28 on the *Ohio*, and arrived November 29, 1898. A, B, C, D, E, H, K, and M, First Washington Infantry, and detachment California Artillery. Total, 28 officers and 779 enlisted men.

Thirteenth.—Col. W. C. Smith, First Tennessee Volunteers. Sailed October 30 on the *Zealandia*, and arrived November 29, 1898. Band, headquarters, A, B, C, E, F, L, and M, First Tennessee Infantry. Total, 24 officers and 543 enlisted men.

Fourteenth.—Col. John C. Loper, Fifty-first Iowa Volunteers. Sailed November 3, on the *Pennsylvania*, and arrived December 5, 1898. Fifty-first Iowa Infantry. Total, 47 officers and 987 enlisted men.

Fifteenth.—Lieut. Col. Gracey Childers, First Tennessee Infantry. Sailed November 6, on the *City of Pueblo*, and arrived December 5, 1898. D, H, G, I, and K, First Tennessee Infantry, detachment California Artillery, and First Troop Nevada Cavalry. Total, 27 officers and 571 enlisted men.

Sixteenth.—Brig. Gen. M. P. Miller. Sailed November 9, and arrived December 6, 1898, on the *Newport*. A, B, F, and L, Twentieth Kansas, and Wyoming Battery. Total, 24 officers and 466 enlisted men.

Seventeenth.—Maj. Gen. H. W. Lawton. Sailed from New York City January 19, 1899, on *Grant*, and arrived March 10, 1899. Fourth Infantry, B, G, I, and M, Seventeenth Infantry. Total, 42 officers and 1,716 enlisted men.

Eighteenth.—Brig. Gen. Loyd Wheaton. Sailed from San Francisco on transport *Scandia* and *Morgan City* January 26, 1899, and arrived February 23, 1899. Twentieth United States Infantry. Total, 41 officers and 1,213 enlisted men.

Nineteenth.—Col. H. C. Egbert, Twenty-second Infantry. Sailed February 1 on *Ohio* and *Senator*, and arrived March 4, 1899. Twenty-second United States Infantry. Total, 37 officers and 1,230 enlisted men.

Twentieth.—Col. J. H. Page, Third Infantry. Sailed from New York on the *Sherman* February 3, 1899, and arrived March 22, 1899. Third Infantry, D, H, K, and L, Seventeenth Infantry. Total, 34 officers and 1,702 enlisted men.

Twenty-first.—Lieut. Col. J. H. Smith, Twelfth Infantry. Sailed February 19, 1899, from New York City on *Sheridan*, and arrived April 14, 1899. Twelfth Infantry, and headquarters A, C, E, and F, Seventeenth Infantry. Total, 57 officers and 1,790 enlisted men, and 56 wives and children.

Twenty-second.—Capt. James Regan, Ninth Infantry. Sailed March 24 on the *City of Pueblo*, and arrived April 22, 1899. Headquarters A, F, G, I, L, and M, Ninth Infantry. Total, 20 officers and 693 enlisted men.

Twenty-third.—Capt. C. M. Rockefeller, Ninth Infantry, sailed March 28 on the *Zealandia*, and arrived April 26, 1899. B, C, D, E, H, and K, Ninth Infantry. Total, 14 officers and 599 enlisted men.

Twenty-fourth.—Col. Jacob Kline, Twenty-first Infantry, sailed April 18, 1899, on *Hancock*, and arrived May 11, 1899. Twenty-first Infantry, Light Battery E, First Artillery. Total, 39 officers and 1,451 enlisted men.

Twenty-fifth.—Colonel Pope, Marine Corps, sailed April 20 on transport *Newport*, and arrived May 23, 1899. Fifteen officers and 260 enlisted men of marines, Light Batteries F, Fourth, and F, Fifth Artillery, under Major Tienon, 8 officers and 223 enlisted men.

The *Warren* sailed same date with headquarters, B, C, E, F, H, L, M, and O, Sixth Artillery, and detachment of recruits, all under command of Gen. E. B. Williston. Total, 25 officers and 1,235 enlisted men. Arrived May 18, 1899.

Twenty-sixth.—Col. A. T. Smith, Thirteenth Infantry, sailed April 28 on the *Senator*, and arrived May 29, 1899. Headquarters, A, C, F, G, H, and I, Thirteenth Infantry. Total, 19 officers and 724 enlisted men.

Sailed on *Ohio*, same date, and arrived May 29, 1899. Capt. J. H. H. Peshino, Thirteenth Infantry, commanding, B, D, E, K, L, and M, Thirteenth Infantry. Total, 13 officers and 729 enlisted men.

Twenty-seventh.—Brig. Gens. J. C. Bates and F. D. Grant. Sailed May 22, on the *Sherman*, and arrived June 19, 1899. Sixth United States Infantry and recruits. Total, 41 officers and 1,858 enlisted men.

Twenty-eighth.—Lieut. Col. W. F. Spurgin, Sixteenth Infantry. Sailed May 30, on the *Grant*, and arrived June 27, 1899. Sixteenth Infantry and recruits. Total, 40 officers and 1,695 enlisted men.

Twenty-ninth.—Maj. J. M. Thompson, Twenty-fourth Infantry. Sailed June 22, on the *Zealandia*, and arrived July 22, 1899. C, E, G, and I, Twenty-fourth Infantry, and detachments. Total, 8 officers and 573 enlisted men.

Thirtieth.—Brig. Gen. S. B. M. Young. Sailed on *Sheridan*, June 24, and arrived July 24, 1899. A and F, Fourth Cavalry, B and H, Fourteenth Infantry, and recruits. Total, 35 officers and 1,629 enlisted men.

Thirty-first.—Maj. Charles Morton, Fourth Cavalry. Sailed June 28, on the *Valencia*, and arrived July 29, 1899. Headquarters, B and M, Fourth Cavalry, and E and H, Twenty-fifth Infantry. Total, 10 officers and 454 enlisted men.

Thirty-second.—Col. A. S. Burt, Twenty-fifth Infantry. Sailed July 1 on *Pennsylvania*, and arrived August 1, 1899. Headquarters, B, F, I, K, L, and M, Twenty-fifth Infantry. Total, 22 officers and 917 enlisted men.

Thirty-third.—Lieut. E. B. Winans, jr., Fourth Cavalry. Sailed July 25 on the *Conemaugh*, and arrived August 18, 1899. Detachment 33 men, Fourth Cavalry, and 275 horses.

Thirty-fourth.—Brig. Gen. T. Schwan. Sailed July 13 on the *City of Para*, and arrived August 11, 1899. D and H, Fourth Cavalry; headquarters, A, F, H, and K, Twenty-fourth Infantry, and B, Engineer Battalion. Total, 36 officers and 911 enlisted men.

Thirty-fifth.—Col. S. Snyder, Nineteenth Infantry. Sailed July 25 on the *Tartar*, and arrived August 20, 1899. Headquarters, B, D, F, G, H, I, K, and M, Nineteenth Infantry. Total, 41 officers and 1,163 enlisted men.

Thirty-sixth.—Maj. O. J. Sweet, Twenty-third Infantry. Sailed July 26 on the *Ohio*, and arrived August 25, 1899. C and L, Nineteenth Infantry, and recruits. Total, 11 officers and 728 enlisted men.

Thirty-seventh.—Capt. G. O. Cress, Fourth Cavalry. Sailed July 26 on the *Tacoma*, and arrived October 13, 1899. Total, 39 enlisted men and 200 horses.

Sailed on the same date on the *Newport*, and arrived August 24, 1899. Capt. F. H. French, Nineteenth Infantry, commanding. A and E, Nineteenth Infantry, and detachment recruits. Total, 11 officers and 489 enlisted men.

Thirty-eighth.—Col. C. C. Hood, Sixteenth Infantry. Sailed August 2 on the *Indiana*, and arrived September 1, 1899. Total, 10 officers and 807 recruits and casuals.

Thirty-ninth.—Maj. W. Wittich, Twenty-first Infantry. Sailed August 10 on the *Morgan City*, and arrived September 19, 1899. Total, 8 officers and 689 recruits.

Fortieth.—Lieut. Col. E. M. Hayes, Fourth Cavalry. Sailed August 15 on the *Senator*, and arrived September 10, 1899. Total, 10 officers and 660 recruits.

Forty-first.—Major Elliott, Marine Corps, and Capt. F. H. Albright, Twenty-fifth Infantry. Sailed August 18 on the *City of Sydney*, and arrived September 19, 1899. Battalion Marine Corps. Total, 17 officers and 362 enlisted men, and 2 officers and 351 recruits, U. S. Army, under Captain Albright.

Forty-second.—First Lieut. E. M. Suplee, Third Cavalry. Sailed August 20 from Seattle on the *Garrone*, and arrived September 30, 1899. Total, 2 officers and 74 enlisted men and 389 horses.

Forty-third.—Lieut. Col. H. W. Wessels, jr., Third Cavalry. Sailed August 25 from Seattle on the *St. Paul*, and arrived October 1, 1899. Headquarters A, C, E, F, K, L, and M, Third Cavalry. Total, 18 officers and 705 enlisted men.

Sailed same date on the *Athenian*, and arrived October 3, 1899. Capt. G. F. Chase, Third Cavalry, commanding. D, Third Cavalry. Total, 3 officers and 102 enlisted men.

Forty-fourth.—Capt. B. D. Devore, Twenty-third Infantry. Sailed August 29 on the *City of Para* from San Francisco, and arrived September 25, 1899. Total, 6 officers and 659 recruits.

Forty-fifth.—First Lieut. W. T. Johnston, Third Cavalry. Sailed September 1, 1899, from Tacoma, on the *Victoria*, and arrived October 9, 1899. Total, 3 officers and 80 enlisted men, Third Cavalry.

Forty-sixth.—First Lieut. B. H. Dorsey, Fourth Cavalry. Sailed September 2, 1899, from San Francisco on the *Leclawna*, and arrived at Honolulu September 14, where the whole command was transferred to the *Athenian*, leaving there November 12, and arriving at Manila December 2, 1899. One officer and 16 men, Fourth Cavalry; 250 horses and 17 teamsters.

Forty-seventh.—Capt. T. W. Moore, Twenty-first Infantry. Sailed September 2, 1899, from San Francisco on the *Warren*, and arrived October 9, 1899. Three hundred and eighty-one recruits; 20 men Signal Corps; 652 recruits for Eleventh Volunteer Cavalry, Thirty-sixth, and Thirty-seventh Volunteer Infantry; 3 Hospital Corps men. Total, 10 officers and 1,056 enlisted men.

Forty-eighth.—Col. L. W. V. Kennon, Thirty-fourth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed September 8, 1899, on the *Columbia*, and arrived October 11, 1899. Headquarters band, E, F, G, H, and L, Thirty-fourth Volunteer Infantry. Total, 18 officers and 563 enlisted men; 3 Hospital Corps men, and Captain Brewster, Ninth Infantry.

Forty-ninth.—Lieut. Col. R. L. Howze, Thirty-fourth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed September 16, 1899, on the *Belgian King*, and arrived October 14, 1899. A, B, C, D, I, K, and M, Thirty-fourth Volunteer Infantry; 29 officers and 740 enlisted men; 9 Hospital Corps men, and 30 recruits. Total, 26 officers and 779 men.

Sailed same date, on the *Aztec*, and arrived October 23, 1899. First Lieut. H. A. Sievert, Fourth Cavalry. Total, 1 officer; 9 enlisted men, volunteers; 366 horses, and 27 civilian employees.

Fiftieth.—Col. J. M. Bell, Twenty-seventh Volunteer Infantry. Sailed September 21, 1899, on the *Tacoma*, and arrived October 27, 1899. Headquarters band, A, B, C, D, I, K, and L, Twenty-seventh Volunteer Infantry. Total, 23 officers and 720 enlisted men, and 6 Hospital Corps men.

Sailed same date, on the *George W. Elder*, and arrived October 21, 1899. Lieut. Col. A. S. Cummins, Twenty-seventh Volunteer Infantry, commanding. E, F, G, H, and M, Twenty-seventh Volunteer Infantry. Total, 20 officers, 488 enlisted men, and 6 Hospital Corps men.

Fifty-first.—Col. C. Gardener, Thirtieth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed September 23, 1899, on the *Sherman*, and arrived October 21, 1899. Thirtieth U. S. Volunteer Infantry, 54 officers, 1,291 enlisted men; 351 recruits, volunteers; 14 Hospital Corps men; 2 men Nineteenth Infantry, and 8 female nurses. Total, 54 officers and 1,658 enlisted men.

Fifty-second.—Col. E. Rice, Twenty-sixth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed September 25, 1899, on the *Grant*, and arrived October 24, 1899. Twenty-sixth U. S. Volunteer Infantry, 49 officers, 1,244 enlisted men; 6 officers, 137 Hospital Corps men, and 250 recruits, United States Army. Total, 55 officers and 1,631 enlisted men.

Fifty-third.—Capt. S. G. Orr, quartermaster Volunteers. Sailed September 27, 1899, on the *Centennial*. (This vessel only went to Honolulu and returned to San Francisco, October 17, 1899.) One acting assistant surgeon, 1 Hospital Corps man, 5 enlisted men, Twenty-sixth Volunteer Infantry; 2 men Thirtieth Volunteer Infantry, and 7 men Thirty-third Volunteer Infantry; 200 public and 40 private horses, and 23 civilian employees.

Fifty-fourth.—Col. L. R. Hare, Thirty-third Volunteer Infantry. Sailed September 30, 1899, on the *Sheridan*, and arrived October 27, 1899. Thirty-third Volunteer Infantry, 47 officers and 1,280 enlisted men. B, H, and I, Thirty-third Volunteer Infantry, 10 officers and 287 enlisted men. Also 7

other officers, 14 Hospital Corps men, and 73 recruits for volunteers. Total, 64 officers and 1,663 enlisted men.

Fifty-fifth.—Maj. C. E. Cabell, Thirty-second Volunteer Infantry. Sailed October 1, 1899, on the *Charles Nelson*, and arrived November 3, 1899. Field and staff, Second Battalion, C and D, Thirty-second Volunteer Infantry, 9 officers and 295 enlisted men. Also 12 other officers, 5 acting assistant surgeons, and 4 Hospital Corps men. Total, 21 officers and 299 enlisted men.

Sailed same date on the *Glenogle*, and arrived October 30, 1899. Col. L. A. Craig, Thirty-second Volunteer Infantry, commanding. Headquarters, A, E, F, G, H, K, L, and M, Thirty-second Volunteer Infantry, 39 officers and 713 enlisted men, and 5 men, Thirty-first and Thirty-third Volunteer Infantry; Capt. B. Johnson, quartermaster. Total, 30 officers and 718 enlisted men.

Fifty-sixth.—Maj. R. D. Walsh, Thirty-fifth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed October 4, 1899, from Portland, Oreg., on the *Sikh*, and arrived November 6, 1899. Twenty-one officers and 630 men, Thirty-fifth Volunteer Infantry; 6 Hospital Corps men; 1 man, Nineteenth Infantry; 2 for Thirty-sixth, 1 for Thirty-seventh, and 7 for Thirty-fifth Volunteer Infantry—recruits. Total, 21 officers and 637 enlisted men.

Sailed on the same date on the *Rio de Janeiro* from Portland, Oreg., and arrived November 6, 1899. Lieut. Col. E. H. Plummer, Thirty-fifth Volunteer Infantry, commanding. Twenty-eight officers and 602 enlisted men, Thirty-fifth Volunteer Infantry, and 21 female Red Cross nurses.

Fifty-seventh.—Col. E. E. Hardin, Twenty-ninth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed October 5, 1899, on the *City of Para*, and arrived November 3, 1899. Headquarters, A, B, C, I, K, L, and M, Twenty-ninth Volunteer Infantry; 30 officers and 687 enlisted men; 16 Hospital Corps men; 2 officers and 37 United States Army recruits, and 48 recruits for Eleventh Volunteer Cavalry. Total, 32 officers and 788 enlisted men.

Lieut. Col. H. H. Sargent, Twenty-ninth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed same date on the *Zealandia*, and arrived November 2, 1899. D, E, F, G, and H, Twenty-ninth Volunteer Infantry, 18 officers and 506 enlisted men; 3 officers; 1 man Hospital Corps; 11 Signal Corps men; 39 recruits for Eleventh Volunteer Cavalry. Total, 21 officers and 557 enlisted men.

Capt. C. B. Hardin, Eighteenth Infantry, commanding. Sailed same date on the *Valencia*, and arrived November 7, 1899. Thirteen officers, 6 Hospital Corps men; 200 recruits for Eleventh Volunteer Cavalry; 165 recruits for Thirty-seventh Volunteer Infantry, and 1 recruit for Twenty-first U. S. Infantry. Total, 13 officers and 432 enlisted men.

Fifty-eighth.—Lieut. Col. R. W. Leonard, Twenty-eighth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed October 20, 1899, on the *Tartar*, and arrived November 23, 1899. First and Second Battalions (A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and H), Twenty-eighth Volunteer Infantry. Total, 31 officers, 829 enlisted men, 8 nurses, and 10 civilian clerks.

Lieut. Col. W. C. Hayes, Thirty-first Volunteer Infantry. Sailed on the same date on the *Manuense*, and arrived November 27, 1899. Field and staff, I, K, L, and M, Thirty-first Volunteer Infantry. Total, 15 officers and 380 enlisted men.

Sailed on the same date on the *Newport*, and arrived November 23, 1899. Maj. J. B. Porter, Twenty-eighth Volunteer Infantry, commanding. I, K, L, and M, Twenty-eighth Volunteer Infantry, 15 officers and 388 enlisted men; 34 Hospital Corps men; 9 Signal Corps men, and 12 officers. Total, 27 officers and 431 enlisted men.

Fifty-ninth.—Col. J. S. Pettit, Thirty-first Volunteer Infantry. Sailed October 28, 1899, on the *City of Peking*, and arrived November 27, 1899. Headquarters, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and H, Thirty-first Volunteer Infantry, 32 officers and 798 enlisted men; 7 officers and 15 men Hospital Corps, 35 casuals, and 90 recruits. Total, 39 officers and 938 enlisted men.

Capt. J. B. Hughes, Fourth Cavalry, commanding. Sailed on the same date on the *Centennial*, and arrived—(this vessel only went to Honolulu). Total, 13 enlisted men, 277 horses, and 23 civilian employees.

Sixtieth.—Col. R. L. Bullard, Thirty-ninth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed November 3, 1899, on the *Pennsylvania*, from Portland, Oreg., and arrived December 7, 1899. Thirty-ninth Volunteer Infantry, 27 officers and 862 enlisted men; 6 officers and 118 recruits, U. S. Army, and 9 Hospital Corpsmen. Total, 33 officers and 989 enlisted men.

Maj. J. H. Parker, Thirty-ninth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed on same date on the *Olympia* from Portland, Oreg., and arrived December 7, 1899. Thirty-ninth Volunteer Infantry, 19 officers, 483 men; L and M, Forty-fifth Volunteer Infantry, 5 officers, 188 men; 6 Hospital Corps men, and 3 men Third Cavalry. Total, 24 officers and 680 enlisted men.

Sixty-first.—Col. Walter Howe, Forty-seventh Volunteer Infantry. Sailed November 4, 1899, on the *Thomas* from New York City, and arrived December 22, 1899. Forty-seventh Volunteer Infantry and detachment. Total, 52 officers and 1,323 enlisted men.

Sixty-second.—Col. W. S. Schuyler, Forty-sixth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed November 14, 1899, on the *City of Sydney*, and arrived December 15, 1899. Forty-sixth Volunteer Infantry. Headquarters, A, B, C, D, E, and F, 25 officers and 663 enlisted men, 5 volunteer officers, 5 U. S. A. officers, 25 recruits, 3 acting assistant surgeons, and 4 nurses. Total, 35 officers and 688 enlisted men.

Sixty-third.—Maj. S. W. Miller, Forty-sixth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed November 14, 1899, on the *Pathan*, and arrived December 15, 1899. G, H, I, K, L, and M, Forty-sixth Volunteer Infantry, 21 officers, 607 enlisted men, and 1 officer and 7 enlisted men, U. S. Army. Total, 22 officers and 614 enlisted men.

Sixty-fourth.—Col. A. Murray, Forty-third Volunteer Infantry. Sailed November 16, 1899, from New York, on the *Meade*, and arrived December 31, 1899. Ten companies, Forty-third Volunteer Infantry (A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, and K). Total, 41 officers and 1,068 enlisted men, and 12 Hospital Corps men.

Sixty-fifth.—Col. J. H. Dorst, Forty-fifth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed November 16, 1899, on the *Senator*, and arrived December 21, 1899. Headquarters, E, F, G, H, and I, Forty-fifth Volunteer Infantry, 18 officers, 548 enlisted men, 2 officers, U. S. Army; 1 officer volunteers, 7 Hospital Corps men, 1 Volunteer and 49 U. S. Army recruits. Total, 21 officers and 605 enlisted men.

Sixty-sixth.—Maj. D. A. Frederick, Forty-fifth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed November 16, 1899, on the *Bennahr*, and arrived December 21, 1899. A, B, C, D, and K, Forty-fifth Volunteer Infantry, 18 officers and 524 enlisted men; 3 officers and 23 recruits, U. S. Army. Also A and N, Sixth Artillery, from Honolulu, November 29, 3 officers and 160 enlisted men. Total, 24 officers and 716 enlisted men.

Sixty-seventh.—Col. E. J. McClelland, Forty-fourth Infantry. Sailed November 20, 1899, on the *Hancock*, and arrived December 19, 1899. Headquarters, A, E, F, G, H, I, K, L, and M, Forty-fourth Volunteer Infantry, 33 officers and 964 enlisted men, 7 officers, U. S. Army, 3 men Sixteenth Infantry, and 14 men Hospital Corps. Total, 40 officers and 981 enlisted men.

Sixty-eighth.—Maj. H. Hale, Forty-fourth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed November 20, 1899, on the *City of Pueblo*, and arrived December 19, 1899. B, C, and D, Forty-fourth Volunteer Infantry, 12 officers and 310 enlisted men; L and M, Forty-third Volunteer Infantry, 6 officers and 305 enlisted men; also 7 officers, U. S. Army, and 57 Hospital Corps men. Total, 25 officers and 572 enlisted men.

Sixty-ninth.—Col. E. T. C. Richmond, Forty-first Volunteer Infantry. Sailed November 20, 1899, on the *Logan*, from New York City, and arrived

January 5, 1900. Forty-first Volunteer Infantry. Total, 52 officers and 1,313 enlisted men.

Seventieth.—Col. G. S. Anderson, Thirty-eighth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed November 21, 1899, on the *St. Paul*, and arrived December 20, 1899. Headquarters, E, F, G, H, K, and L, Thirty-eighth Volunteer Infantry, 28 officers and 614 enlisted men; 1 officer and 45 recruits, U. S. Army, and 5 volunteer recruits. Total, 29 officers and 664 enlisted men.

Seventy-first.—Maj. C. H. Muir, Thirty-eighth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed November 21, 1899, on the *Duke of Fife*, and arrived December 20, 1899. A, B, C, D, I, and M, Thirty-eighth Volunteer Infantry, 19 officers and 618 enlisted men; also 3 officers and 105 men U. S. Army. Total, 22 officers and 723 enlisted men.

Seventy-second.—Col. E. A. Godwin, Fortieth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed November 24, 1899, on the *Ohio*, and arrived December 26, 1899. Headquarters, A, B, C, D, L, and M, Fortieth Volunteer Infantry, 18 officers and 645 enlisted men; 5 officers and 207 recruits U. S. Army; 23 Hospital Corps men, and 6 casuals. Total, 23 officers and 881 enlisted men.

Maj. W. E. Craighill, Fortieth Volunteer Infantry, commanding. Sailed same date on the *Indiana*, and arrived December 26, 1899. E, F, G, H, I, and K, Fortieth Volunteer Infantry, 20 officers and 620 enlisted men; 7 officers and 18 recruits, volunteers, and 2 officers and 82 recruits, U. S. Army. Total, 29 officers and 720 enlisted men.

Seventy-third.—Maj. W. C. Brown, Forty-second Volunteer Infantry. Sailed November 30, 1899, on the *Dabney Foslock*, and arrived December 31, 1899. A, B, C, D, E, F, and G, Forty-second Volunteer Infantry, 25 officers and 716 enlisted men; 9 Hospital Corps men, and Captain Dent, Twentieth Infantry. Total, 26 officers and 725 enlisted men.

Sailed same date on the *Columbia*, and arrived December 31, 1899. Lieut. Col. J. H. Beacom, Forty-second Volunteer Infantry, commanding. Headquarters, H, I, K, L, and M, Forty-second Volunteer Infantry, 21 officers and 539 enlisted men; 8 men Hospital Corps, and 2 men Sixteenth Infantry. Total, 21 officers and 549 enlisted men.

Seventy-fourth.—Col. W. H. Beck, Forty-ninth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed December 2, 1899, on the *Warren*, and arrived January 2, 1900. Headquarters, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and H, Forty-ninth Volunteer Infantry, 35 officers and 832 enlisted men; 10 Hospital Corps men, and 1 man Sixteenth Infantry. Total, 35 officers and 863 enlisted men.

Seventy-fifth.—Maj. G. W. Kirkman, Forty-ninth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed December 6, 1899, on the *Sherman*, and arrived January 2, 1900. Headquarters, I, K, L, and M, Forty-ninth Volunteer Infantry, 11 officers, 415 enlisted men; 10 regular and 5 volunteer officers; 8 men Signal Corps, 26 men Hospital Corps; 149 U. S. Army, and 24 volunteer recruits. Total, 26 officers and 622 enlisted men.

Sailed same date on the *Centennial*, and arrived at Honolulu December 16; transferred to the *Athenian*; sailed January 16, 1900, and arrived at Manila January 30, 1900. Capt. L. M. Koehler, Fourth Cavalry, commanding; 1 man Hospital Corps; 9 men Thirty-eighth, and 4 men Fortieth Volunteer Infantry; 25 civilian employees, 120 horses, and 165 mules. Total, 1 officer and 14 enlisted men.

Seventy-sixth.—Capt. J. S. Michael, assistant quartermaster. Sailed December 13, 1899, on the *Victoria*, and arrived January 6, 1900. Five men, Forty-second Volunteer Infantry; 6 men, Forty-ninth Volunteer Infantry; 1 Hospital Corps man; 23 horses, 316 mules, and 50 civilian employees.

Seventy-seventh.—Col. W. P. Duvall, Forty-eighth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed December 21, 1899, on the *Grant*, and arrived January 25, 1900. Forty-eighth Volunteer Infantry, 47 officers and 1,299 enlisted men; 4 officers, United States Army; 3 commissary sergeants, 21 Hospital Corps men, and 1 man, Twenty-fourth Infantry. Total, 51 officers and 1,314 enlisted men.

Seventy-eighth.—Second Lieut. W. H. Winters, Third Cavalry. Sailed December 23, 1899, on the *Westminster*, and arrived February 6, 1900. One Hospital Corps man, 6 men, Forty-eighth Volunteer Infantry; 226 horses, 80 mules, and 36 civilian employees.

Seventy-ninth.—Capt. G. G. Gale, Fourth Cavalry. Sailed January 10, 1900, on the *Aztec*, and arrived February 23, 1900. Two officers, 2 enlisted men, and 165 horses, and 185 mules.

Eightieth.—Col. H. B. Freeman, Twenty-fourth Infantry. Sailed January 11, 1900, on the *Tartar*, and arrived February 7, 1900. Total, 16 officers and 458 recruits and detachments.

Eighty-first.—Maj. L. H. Roudiez, quartermaster, Volunteers. Sailed January 17, 1900, from Tacoma, Wash., on the *Sheridan*, and arrived February 15, 1900. One officer, 11 enlisted men, and 5 acting assistant surgeons.

Eighty-second.—Capt. W. S. Wood, assistant quartermaster. Sailed January 19, 1900, from Seattle, Wash., on the *Port Albert*, and arrived March 16, 1900. One acting assistant surgeon, 1 man Hospital Corps, 67 civilian employees, 400 horses, and 115 mules.

Eighty-third.—First Lieut. Thaddeus B. Seigle, Thirty-eighth Volunteer Infantry. Sailed January 25, 1900, on the *Pennsylvania*, and arrived February 24, 1900. Four officers, United States Army; 20 Signal Corps men, 9 men Fourth Cavalry; 1 Hospital Corps man, and 3 acting assistant surgeons. Total, 5 officers and 20 enlisted men.

Eighty-fourth.—Maj. C. D. Cowles, Seventeenth Infantry. Sailed February 17, 1900, on the *Sherman*, and arrived March 14, 1900. Nine officers, 4 acting assistant surgeons, 17 Signal Corps men, 161 Hospital Corps men, and 15 recruits. Total, 9 officers and 353 enlisted men.

Eighty-fifth.—Capt. E. F. Glenn, Twenty-fifth Infantry. Sailed March 1, 1900, on the *Thomas*, and arrived March 27, 1900. Nine officers, 5 Signal Corps men, 30 Hospital Corps, and 33 recruits. Total, 9 officers and 88 enlisted men.

Eighty-sixth.—Lieut. L. B. Burgess, Fifth Artillery. Sailed March 17, 1900, on the *Meade*, and arrived April 15, 1900. Nine officers, 70 men Hospital Corps, 4 Signal Corps, 24 recruits, and 21 acting assistant surgeons. Total, 9 officers and 98 enlisted men.

Eighty-seventh.—Col. Wirt Davis, Third Cavalry. Sailed March 31, 1900, from New York City, on the *Sumner*, and arrived May 23, 1900. Total, 46 officers and 685 recruits.

Eighty-eighth.—Capt. C. D. Palmer, assistant quartermaster. Sailed April 1, 1900, on the *Grant*, and arrived April 30, 1900. Two officers and 144 men, Signal and Hospital corps.

Eighty-ninth.—Capt. E. L. King, Eleventh Volunteer Cavalry. Sailed May 1, 1900, on the *Warren*, and arrived May 28, 1900. Sixteen officers, 36 prisoners' escort, 20 men Signal Corps, 73 men Hospital Corps, 335 recruits and casuals, and 6 acting assistant surgeons. Total, 16 officers and 467 enlisted men.

Ninetieth.—Col. C. C. Carr, Fourth Cavalry. Sailed May 16, 1900, on the *Logan*, and arrived June 14, 1900. Total, 7 officers and 161 enlisted men.

Ninety-first.—Maj. M. C. Foote, Ninth Infantry. Sailed June 1, 1900, on the *Sherman*, and arrived June 28, 1900. Three officers, 12 Hospital Corps men; also 10 men for the Sixth Artillery at Honolulu.

Ninety-second.—Maj. C. A. Williams, Seventeenth Infantry. Sailed June 10, 1900, on the *Thomas*, and arrived —. Seven officers, 23 Hospital Corps men, and 360 recruits and casuals.

Ninety-third.—Lieut. E. R. Heiberg, Sixth Cavalry. Sailed July 1, 1900, on

the *Conemaugh*, and arrived —. Two officers, 23 men, Sixth Cavalry; 1 man Hospital Corps, 147 horses and 94 mules.

Sailed same date on the *Leelaena*, and arrived —. Lieut. C. D. Rhodes, Sixth Cavalry, commanding. Two officers, 31 men, Sixth Cavalry; 1 man Hospital Corps, 232 horses, and 3 civilian employees.

Ninety-fourth.—Gen. A. R. Chaffee, U. S. Vols. Sailed July 3, 1900, on the *Grant*, and arrived —. Two battalions, Sixth Cavalry, 15 officers and 729 enlisted men, and 312 recruits; 12 officers; 42 Hospital Corps men; 7 Signal Corps men. Total, 27 officers and 1,000 enlisted men U. S. A. Marine Corps, 8 officers and 221 men; United States Navy, 2 officers and 35 men. Total on board, 37 officers and 1,347 men.

Ninety-fifth.—First Lieut. F. C. Marshall, Sixth Cavalry. Sailed July 6, 1900, on the *Lennox*, from Portland, Oreg., and arrived —. Two officers and 42 men, Sixth Cavalry, and 1 Hospital Corps man.

CORPS, DEPARTMENTS, AND DIVISIONS.

Eighth Army Corps: Troops belonging to, returned from Philippines to August 15, 1899: Regulars, 1 officer, 98 men; Volunteers, 300 officers, 6,671 men.

MEMORANDUM DESCRIPTIVE OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

The present organization of the Corps of Engineers was fixed by the act of July 5, 1898, which provides "That the Corps of Engineers of the Army shall hereafter consist of one Chief of Engineers, with the rank of brigadier-general, seven colonels, fourteen lieutenant-colonels, twenty-eight majors, thirty-five captains, thirty first lieutenants, twelve second lieutenants, and the battalion of engineers."

The Battalion of Engineers is a body of troops armed and equipped as infantry and drilled in the duties of infantry as well as in special technical duties comprising pontooning and bridging, field fortifications, submarine and land mine service, etc. Its duties correspond to those of the Royal engineer troops of the British army, to the pioneers of the German army, and the sappers and miners of the French army. The officers of the battalion are not permanently attached, but detailed from time to time from among the officers of the Corps of Engineers having suitable rank. The present legal enlisted strength of the battalion consists of five companies of 150 men each, with a battalion sergeant-major and a battalion quartermaster-sergeant. The organization of the Corps of Engineers, therefore, includes an aggregate of 127 commissioned officers and 752 enlisted men. There are now 125 officers in the corps.

The duties of the Corps of Engineers are defined in A. R. 1472, as follows: "The duties of the Corps of Engineers comprise reconnoitering and surveying for military purposes; selection of sites and formation of plans and estimates for military defenses; construction and repair of fortifications and their accessories; planning and superintending of defensive or offensive works of troops in the field; examination of routes of communications for supplies, and for military movements and construction of military roads and bridges; execution of river and harbor improvements assigned to it, and such other duties as the President may order. It collects, arranges, and preserves all correspondence, reports, memoirs, estimates, plans, drawings, deeds, and titles relating to the Washington Aqueduct and public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia, and models which concern or relate in anywise to the several duties above enumerated."

In addition to the foregoing duties, special duties relating to public engineering questions are from time to time assigned to the Corps of Engineers by laws of Congress, and a considerable number of officers are at all times on detached duty at the United States Military Academy as instructors; in the government of the District of Columbia; as staff officers to commanding generals; on light-house duty, and for other purposes.

The most important duties of the Corps of Engineers at the present time are the planning and construction of permanent works of defense, the works of river and harbor and canal improvement, the water supply of the District of Columbia, and the construction of the Government Printing Office, upon all of which the annual expenditures for several years past have averaged about \$25,000,000. For purposes of administration the country is divided into geographical districts and divisions, each in charge of an officer of suitable rank, who is responsible to the Chief of Engineers for the work in his district or division.

The Chief of Engineers has his headquarters in Washington, and his office is one of the bureaus of the War Department.

All officers of the Corps of Engineers are graduates of the United States Military Academy, and are appointed upon the recommendation of the academic staff from amongst the highest graduates, the number so appointed annually depending upon the vacancies occurring in the corps throughout the year and averaging three or four in number.

Although reference is made to engineer troops and officers in earlier acts of Congress, the Corps of Engineers, as it now exists, originated in the act of March 16, 1802, and was closely connected with the foundation of the United States Military Academy. The present Battalion of Engineers originated in the act of Congress of May 15, 1846, which added to the Corps of Engineers one company of engineer soldiers. The company formed under this act is Company A, of the battalion, which preserves an enviable record for service during the Mexican and civil wars. By successive acts of Congress on different dates, the organization of the Corps of Engineers was changed from time to time as affected its commissioned and enlisted strength until it reached the proportions indicated at the beginning of this article.

DECEASED SOLDIERS.

Annual death rates per thousand of mean strength among volunteer and regular troops serving in Cuba, Porto Rico, the Philippine Islands, and in the United States during the years 1898 and 1899.

	Cuba.				Porto Rico.			
	1898.		1899.		1898.		1899.	
	Vol-un-teers.	Regu-lars.	Vol-un-teers.	Regu-lars.	Vol-un-teers.	Regu-lars.	Vol-un-teers.	Regu-lars.
All causes.....	86.00	98.16	16.46	52.09	41.45	10.53
All injuries.....	12.35	37.01	1.48	2.66	2.07	2.63
Gunshot injuries.....	11.91	33.33	.62	1.86	1.04
All diseases.....	73.65	61.15	14.97	49.43	39.38	7.89
Typhoid fever.....	22.05	14.17	2.72	40.66	22.80	2.63
Yellow fever.....	15.88	17.57	.1227	.52
Smallpox.....25	2.92	5.70
Malarial fevers.....	14.77	13.12	3.71	1.06	2.07
Diarrheal diseases.....	9.26	9.97	2.7227	.52
Pneumonia.....	.66	.26	1.36

Annual death rate per thousand of mean strength among volunteer and regular troops serving in Cuba, Porto Rico, etc.—Continued.

	Philippines.				United States.			
	1898.		1899.		1898.		1899.	
	Vol-un-teers.	Regu-lars.	Vol-un-teers.	Regu-lars.	Vol-un-teers.	Regu-lars.	Vol-un-teers.	Regu-lars.
All causes.....	24.70	22.74	29.83	24.41	20.14	7.26
All injuries.....	3.43	4.13	18.03	1.11	2.69	.94
Gunshot injuries.....	2.86	3.10	16.8143	1.21	.62
All diseases.....	21.27	18.60	11.80	23.29	17.45	6.32
Typhoid fever.....	9.28	7.58	2.20	16.59	8.79	1.19
Yellow fever.....01	.08
Smallpox.....	2.14	2.07	3.3612
Malarial fevers.....	1.43	1.72	.43	1.26	2.24	.37
Diarrheal diseases.....	3.15	1.72	3.1873	1.39	.38
Pneumonia.....	1.14	.69	1.14	1.00	.92	2.38

Admissions to sick report and deaths in the United States Army, May, 1861, to May 1862, inclusive.

Month.	Mean strength.	Total admissions.	Total deaths.
1861.			
May.....	16,161	5,130	19
June.....	66,950	22,587	99
July.....	69,118	23,904	194
August.....	109,054	41,387	330
September.....	162,217	51,810	438
October.....	252,037	74,284	848
November.....	296,025	83,436	1,265
December.....	336,745	89,892	1,578
1862.			
January.....	343,572	85,081	1,664
February.....	316,568	66,847	1,515
March.....	314,961	64,468	1,915
April.....	395,713	106,075	3,331
May.....	388,492	95,724	3,077

RATIOS PER THOUSAND OF MEAN STRENGTH DEDUCED FROM THE NUMBERS IN THE PRECEDING TABULATION.

1861.			
May.....	16,161	317.45	1.18
June.....	66,950	337.37	1.48
July.....	69,118	345.84	2.81
August.....	109,054	379.51	3.03
September.....	162,217	319.39	2.70
October.....	252,037	294.73	3.36
November.....	296,025	281.84	4.27
December.....	336,745	266.94	4.69
1862.			
January.....	343,572	247.63	4.84
February.....	316,568	211.16	4.79
March.....	314,961	204.69	6.08
April.....	395,713	268.06	8.42
May.....	388,492	246.39	7.92

Admissions to sick report and deaths in the United States Army, May to September, 1898.
[Reported to October 25, 1898.]

Month.	Mean strength.	Total admissions.	Total deaths.
May:			
Regulars.....	46,157	4,244	15
Volunteers.....	105,528	5,964	55
June:			
Regulars.....	32,887	3,702	37
Volunteers.....	126,906	20,637	75
July:			
Regulars.....	40,111	8,684	163
Volunteers.....	163,139	32,980	274
August:			
Regulars.....	38,182	12,089	235
Volunteers.....	152,165	41,616	551
September:			
Regulars.....	27,082	10,682	82
Volunteers.....	103,681	17,862	238
Total:			
Regulars.....	36,884	39,401	522
Volunteers.....	130,284	119,059	1,193

RATIOS PER THOUSAND OF MEAN STRENGTH DEDUCED FROM THE NUMBERS IN THE PRECEDING TABULATION.

May:			
Regulars.....	46,157	91.95	0.32
Volunteers.....	105,528	56.52	.52
June:			
Regulars.....	32,887	112.58	1.13
Volunteers.....	126,90659

Admissions to sick report and deaths in the United States Army, etc.—Continued.
RATIOS PER THOUSAND OF MEAN STRENGTH DEDUCED FROM THE NUMBERS IN THE PRECEDING TABULATION—Continued.

Month.	Mean strength.	Total admissions.	Total deaths.
July:			
Regulars	40,111	216.50	4.06
Volunteers	163,139	202.18	1.68
August:			
Regulars	38,182	316.62	5.89
Volunteers	152,165	273.49	3.62
September:			
Regulars	27,082	394.43	3.03
Volunteers	103,681	172.28	2.30
Total:			
Regulars	36,884	1,068.24	14.15
Volunteers	130,284	913.84	9.16

Admission to sick report and deaths in the United States Army, May to September, 1898.
[Reported to October 25, 1898.]

Month.	Mean strength.	Total admissions.	Total deaths.
May	151,685	10,208	70
June	159,793	24,339	112
July	203,250	41,664	437
August	190,347	53,705	776
September	130,763	28,544	320
Total	167,168	158,460	1,715

RATIOS PER THOUSAND OF MEAN STRENGTH DEDUCED FROM THE NUMBERS IN THE PRECEDING TABULATION.

Month.	Mean strength.	Total admissions.	Total deaths.
May	151,685	67.30	0.46
June	159,793	152.32	.70
July	203,250	204.99	2.15
August	190,347	282.14	4.08
September	130,763	218.29	2.45

Reports to the Adjutant-General to September 30, 1898, show 345 killed and died of wounds, and 2,485 died of disease, in a mean strength of 275,000 men.

Number of those in the Army who died from disease between May 1, 1898, and June 30, 1899: In Cuba, 34 officers, 88 men; in Porto Rico, 4 officers, 251 men; in the Philippines, 11 officers, 369 men.

The total number of deaths in our armies, regular and volunteer, from May 1, 1898, to June 30, 1899, was 6,619. This is equivalent to an annual rate of 33.03 per thousand of strength, the rate for disease being 25.68. The death rate from disease among troops in the United States was 23.81; in Cuba, 45.14; in Porto Rico, 38.15, and in Manila, 17.20, the absolute numbers being, respectively, 3,577, 928, 238, and 402. Deaths on transports en voyage have been included in the total of the country from which the vessel sailed.

Among the regulars in the United States there occurred 809 deaths from disease during the fourteen months, among the volunteers, 2,768 deaths, equivalent, respectively, to an annual death rate of 17.43 and 26.67 per thousand of strength.

Typhoid fever was accountable for more than one-half of the deaths from disease. The total number of deaths from this disease was 2,774, equal to an annual rate of 13.84. Among troops serving in the United States the rate was 14.99, in Cuba 11.23, in Porto Rico 26.93, and in the Philippines 5.30. In Porto Rico the deaths from this disease (168) formed more than two-thirds of the total deaths from disease (238). In the United States the regulars lost 361 and the volunteers 1,890 from this fever, these numbers being equivalent to the respective rates of 7.78 and 18.21 per thousand of strength.

Malarial fevers are held accountable for 476 deaths, constituting an annual rate of 2.38. The rate of death from these fevers was highest in Cuba, 10.80; lowest in Luzon, 0.64—222 deaths having occurred in the former island and only 15 in the latter.

Pneumonia caused 359 deaths. The death rate from this disease was larger in the United States (2.07) than in Cuba (1.60), Porto Rico (0.48), or the Philippines (0.51).

Diarrheal diseases were the cause of 342 deaths, equaling a rate of 1.71. The mortality from these diseases was relatively heaviest in Cuba, the rate there being 5.69.

Yellow fever caused 185 deaths, 178 of which occurred in Cuba, 6 in the United States, and 1 in Porto Rico; and smallpox 98 deaths—90 in the Philippines, 4 in Cuba, 2 in the United States, and 2 in Porto Rico.

Many of the deaths, however, can not be distributed among their causes until the medical records of the Volunteer Army are available for statistical study. The figures just given, together with the minor details presented in Tables VI and VII on pages 347-349 infra, are therefore subject to material change when this study has been completed.

Bodies of Americans returned by the Government from Cuba to the United States, 861; from Porto Rico to the United States, 228; from the Philippine Islands to the United States, 56; from Honolulu to the United States, 17.

Bodies returned from—	
Cuba	891
Porto Rico	250
Philippine Islands	56
Hawaiian Islands	17

Total bodies returned to June 30, 1899..... 1,214
Total yellow-fever cases disinterred which are now stored at Santiago for future disposition..... 72

The remains of 601 of those above reported as returned from Cuba and Porto Rico were reinterred with appropriate ceremonies at the Arlington National Cemetery, near this city, being placed in a burial section specially prepared and set apart for that purpose.

Under orders issued by the Department in January, 1899, a burial corps was organized, which proceeded to Santiago, Cuba, and thence to Porto Rico, and disinterred in those islands and brought to this country the remains of 1,122 American

soldiers, sailors, and marines, 969 of which were identified and 153 unidentified. Six hundred and one of the remains thus returned were reinterred in a special section prepared and set apart for that purpose in the Arlington National Cemetery.

A similar expedition sailed on the 28th of October, 1898, from the port of San Francisco for Manila to perform the same sad office for the Americans who have fallen during the struggles with Spain and the Tagalog insurgents in the Philippine Islands.

Period, July 1, 1899, to June 30, 1900.

Bodies of Americans returned by the Government from Cuba to the United States, 474; sailors and marines, 6; civilians, 13. From Porto Rico to the United States, 83; civilians, 4. From the Philippine Islands to the United States, 1,327; sailors and marines, 7; civilians, 23. From Honolulu to the United States, 2.

El Caney.

El Caney is a village near Santiago de Cuba, which was strongly defended by the Spaniards, and where the battle of the same name was fought on July 1, 1898, the Spanish forces being commanded by General Vara del Rey, who was killed in the action, and the United States forces by Maj. Gen. Henry W. Lawton, U. S. V. The battle raged from daylight until about 3 p. m., when the village was captured by the Americans. The fighting was desperate and the casualties many. This town afterwards became the asylum of many thousands of Cuban refugees and Spanish noncombatants who were allowed to leave Santiago before it was shelled by the American Navy.

ENGINEER DEPARTMENT.

Memoranda of work done under the Engineer Department, United States Army, since the declaration of war with Spain.

1. *River, harbor, canal, and bridge work, roads, water supply, etc.*—Operations have been in progress upon extensive and important works of river and harbor improvement, canal and bridge construction, water supply, Government Printing Office, construction of military roads and surveys, involving the expenditure of many millions of dollars on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts and upon the great inland rivers, canals, etc., throughout the United States.

This work has been pushed vigorously and, as a rule, with most satisfactory results.

2. *Gun and mortar batteries for seacoast defense.*—Existing approved projects for seacoast defenses contemplate the emplacement of about 480 heavy guns of 8, 10, 12, and 16 inch caliber, of about 850 rapid-fire guns, and of about 900 mortars.

Provision has already been made for emplacing 309 heavy guns, 368 rapid-fire guns, and 372 mortars. This armament is disposed of at 77 localities in 30 harbors in the United States.

When diplomatic relations with Spain began to assume a threatening character, orders were given to push work with all possible energy and to mount every available gun as fast as delivered. Operations were carried on with double and, in some cases, with three shifts of workmen, and were pushed regardless of weather and climate. The extraordinary efforts made resulted in most gratifying success, especially in the number of guns available for service, and during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, there were mounted six 12-inch guns, fifty-two 10-inch guns, thirty 8-inch guns, twenty-six rapid-fire guns, and seventy-one 12-inch mortars. Work was continued with all reasonable speed during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, although night work was suspended after the cessation of hostilities, and during this period the seacoast armament was increased by the addition of thirteen 12-inch guns, fourteen 10-inch guns, twenty-four 8-inch guns, twenty rapid-fire guns, and thirty-two 12-inch mortars.

The work of strengthening and adding to the seacoast defenses has been steadily pushed during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, at which date the status of the seacoast armament was as follows:

	12-inch.	10-inch.	8-inch.	Rapid-fire.	12-inch mortars.
Guns mounted	58	105	65	53	240
Ready for armament	22	8	26	*189	84
Under construction	13	9	3	81	48
Not yet begun				45	
Total	93	122	94	369	372

* Including 70 six-pounders not requiring permanent emplacements.

A number of these new batteries have already been equipped with electric-light and power plants for lighting magazines and passageways, and for operating ammunition lifts.

Submarine mines.

At the outbreak of hostilities with Spain there were on hand a considerable number of mine cases and a limited quantity of operating apparatus, but no cable, explosives, search lights, or any of the multitude of minor articles needed to plant and operate the mines. Steps were at once taken to procure as rapidly as possible all needed material for placing in position at every important harbor a preliminary line of mines. Only the more important items of torpedo material purchased can be given here; they comprise about 700 miles of single and multiple cable, 150 tons of explosives, 3,000 mine cases, 44 electric search lights, 17 sets of casemate operating apparatus, besides a large number of compound plugs, circuit closers, and regulators for mines, and a multitude of minor articles absolutely necessary for the proper manipulation of the great submarine mine system; by June 30, 1899, over 1,500 submarine mines had been planted in 28 different harbors with all their cables, anchors, junction boxes, and the necessary operating apparatus installed; work was continued until the cessation of hostilities, when the mines were either exploded or removed, cables taken up, all apparatus cleaned and properly stored for future use.

For the preservation and maintenance of mine fields it was necessary to enforce special rules for the navigation of friendly vessels, involving the employment of a large number of tugs and boats, with a numerous personnel, at an approximate daily cost during the war of about \$3,000.

Since the war efforts have been directed toward supplying proper storage facilities for the immense quantity of material acquired, and toward supplying all needed minor articles for the complete equipment of the mines and cables on hand. On June 30, 1900, practically all articles needed for the equipment of mines and cable on hand had been purchased and stored at the various harbors. With the exception of search-light outfits, of which a considerable number are still needed, the torpedo defenses of the country are at present in excellent condition.

Dynamite batteries.

Dynamite batteries were erected under the supervision of the Ordnance Department at San Francisco and New York harbors, and the Engineer Department constructed the necessary parapets, magazines, etc. Additional dynamite batteries are now being constructed at Fishers Island, N. Y., and Port Royal, S. C., for which the Engineer Department will also build magazines and parapets, the necessary funds therefor having already been appropriated.

Range and position finders.

The work of installing range and position finders forming a part of the fire-control equipment for seacoast forts was commenced during the war with Spain. At the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, provision had been made for the construction of over 80 stations for type A range finders, many of which were fully completed, and for underground conduits at four artillery posts. A large number of emergency type B range finders had also been installed in the various completed batteries.

Pontoon trains, tools, siege materials, etc.

About 1,000 feet of bridge trains were sent out for the use of troops operating in Cuba and Porto Rico, and 1,000 additional feet with wagons complete was prepared ready for service.

Tools and siege materials were purchased for actual working parties of about 40,000 men, and large amounts sent to the troops in Manila, Cuba, Porto Rico, and to the camps of instruction throughout the country.

Since the war with Spain supplies of tools, instruments, drawing and photographic materials required for the use of the troops operating in our insular possessions have been promptly furnished as called for by the engineer officers on the staffs of corps, division, and department commanders.

Corps and Battalion of Engineers.

The Corps of Engineers furnished for service with volunteer troops in the field during the war with Spain 4 general officers, 2 colonels, 11 lieutenant-colonels, and 2 majors. In addition to these, Company A, of the Battalion of Engineers, fully officered from the corps, served in the Manila campaign and has since been joined in the Philippines by Company C. Company A was highly commended for excellent service, both in engineer and infantry duty. Companies C and E, fully officered from the corps, did splendid service during the Santiago campaign and were commended for the energy and skill shown in the performance of duty under fire and elsewhere. Company D, with details from other companies (in all, 153 men), was engaged in submarine mine duty at 19 harbors on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts.

Company B was constantly engaged at the engineer depot at Willets Point, receiving, storing, and distributing the vast amount of torpedo material, pontoon equipage, siege materials, and instruments purchased and distributed from the depot, under the immediate direction of Maj. J. G. D. Knight, Corps of Engineers, the post commander, and in preparing and maintaining the submarine mine defenses at the eastern entrance to New York Harbor.

Since the war with Spain engineer officers have constantly been on duty in Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, either as engineer officers on the staffs of division or department commanders or serving with engineer troops. Company E, Battalion of Engineers, was en route to the Orient at the close of the fiscal year, giving three companies of engineer troops for duty in China and the Philippines. The work of the engineers has consisted in map making, road and railroad repairs and construction, bridge and ferry construction, sanitary and municipal engineering work, and duty as guards and outposts. Both officers and men have acquitted themselves creditably and have won the commendation of their superior officers.

GUAM, LADRONES (SEE TREATY OF PEACE).

The island of Guam or Guahan, the largest in the Marianne or Ladron Archipelago, was ceded by Spain to the United States in 1898, and will probably be used as a coaling station for the United States Navy. The island is about 32 miles long and 100 miles in circumference, and has a population of about 9,000, of whom about 6,000 are in Agaña, the capital. The inhabitants are mostly immigrants or the descendants of immigrants from the Philippines, the original race of the Marianne Islands having become extinct. The recognized language is Spanish, but English is spoken. On the island there are 18 schools, and nine-tenths of the islanders can read and write. The island is thickly wooded, well watered and fertile, and possesses a roadstead.

The Marianes extend in a northerly and southerly direction between latitudes 13° 12' north and 20° 52' north, a distance of about 420 miles, and all are volcanic. The island was captured by the U. S. S. *Charleston* on June 21, 1898, and the territory was ceded to the United States in April, 1899.

HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

The Hawaiian Islands lie between parallels 18° 50' and 23° 5' north latitude, and between meridians 154° 40' and 161° 50' west. Honolulu, the capital and chief city, lies 2,080 miles from San Francisco. In general, the islands are mountainous, covered with verdure, and in parts, especially of Hawaii, possessing very considerable areas of forest whose vegetation is that of the Tropics. The Hawaiian group is composed of eight inhabited and four uninhabited islands. The total area of the inhabited islands is about 6,040 square miles. The total population in 1898 was estimated at 117,281. The chief industry is the cultivation of the sugar cane.

HOSPITALS.

From the declaration of war with Spain to September 20, 1899, there have been established:

	Beds.
20 field division hospitals, averaging 250 beds each.....	5,000
31 general hospitals with a total capacity of about.....	13,800
Railroad ambulance train.....	270
4 hospital ships.....	1,000
Total.....	20,070

In addition to these over 5,000 cases were treated in civil hospitals.

It is difficult even to approximate the number of men treated in these hospitals. During that period somewhat over 100,000 cases were admitted on sick report, a number equal to 2,147 per 1,000 of strength during the year, or to 179 per 1,000 per month—the ratio of admissions to hospital cases being 13 to 8. Using these data as a basis, and assuming the mean strength of the Army (Regulars and Volunteers) to have been 154,000, it would appear that from May 1, 1898, to September 20, 1899, about 275,000 cases have been treated in these hospitals.

HOSPITAL CORPS.

The Hospital Corps, U. S. Army, which was organized by act of Congress approved March 1, 1887, consists of hospital stewards, acting hospital stewards, and privates. The Hospital Corps is attached to the Medical Department and is not included in the effective strength of the Army.

March 31, 1898, there were in service 100 hospital stewards, 103 acting hospital stewards, and 620 privates.

After the declaration of war with Spain an enormous increase in this force was needed for service with the army in the field. Enlistments were not rapidly made at first, the pressure being for enlistments in the volunteers, but by June 30, 1898, the Hospital Corps had increased to—

Hospital stewards.....	133
Acting hospital stewards.....	172
Privates.....	2,940
Total.....	3,245

the larger part of the privates having been gained by transfer from the line.

On September 30, 1898, the Hospital Corps consisted of—

Hospital stewards.....	163
Acting hospital stewards.....	445
Privates.....	5,980

Total..... 6,588

From this maximum the force gradually decreased, mainly through the discharge of men who had enlisted for the war only, until on June 30, 1899, the force present was:

Hospital stewards.....	189
Acting hospital stewards.....	287
Privates.....	2,892

Total..... 3,368

The increase in the strength of the Army for service in the Philippines and the needs of the service in China have made necessary a corresponding increase in the Hospital Corps. Enlistments have been progressing actively of late. The force July 31, 1900, was distributed as follows:

	Hospital stewards.	Acting hospital stewards.	Privates.	Total.
California.....	14	17	217	248
Colorado.....	8	7	42	57
Columbia.....	6	9	39	54
Alaska.....	5	10	39	54
Dakota.....	5	5	43	53
East.....	26	43	269	338
Lakes.....	5	1	35	41
Missouri.....	8	8	81	97
Texas.....	3	6	39	48
Independent posts in the United States.....	16	18	136	170
Total in United States.....	96	124	940	1,160
Cuba.....	17	37	243	297
Porto Rico.....	3	9	58	70
Hawaii.....	1	2	13	16
Philippines.....	45	188	2,072
For Philippine Islands from Hawaiian Islands.....	1	1	10
For Philippine Islands from United States.....	1	2,318
In China from Philippine Islands.....	1	3	37
In China and en route from the United States.....	1	12	109	163
Transports:				
East.....	5	12
West.....	7	30
Hospital ship.....	2	3	34	93
Total Hospital Corps.....	167	391	3,559	4,117

After the declaration of war with Spain the authorized increase of the Regular Army and the muster in of volunteer troops necessitated a corresponding increase of the hospital corps. To hasten this increase of the corps and to utilize the services of suitable men already in the volunteers, General Orders, No. 58, Adjutant-General's Office, May 31, 1898, provided that enlisted men of volunteer organizations could be transferred to the hospital corps of the Regular Army by the commanding general of an army corps, upon the recommendation of the chief surgeon. The corps commander was also given full control of the enlistment, reenlistment, and discharge of members of the hospital corps and the detail of acting hospital stewards, and the provisions of army regulations which conflicted with this order were suspended during the existence of the war. A large number of privates were transferred under this order, most of whom were untrained in hospital corps duties. By General Orders, 178, Adjutant-General's Office, November 8, 1898, the authority over the hospital corps given to corps commanders was extended to commanders of military departments outside the limits of the United States. This order was reaffirmed in a slightly different form by paragraph 2, General Orders, 86, Adjutant-General's Office, May 2, 1899, in which the provision of the original order, which limited its operation to time of war, was omitted. Paragraph 2, General Orders, No. 40, Adjutant-General's Office, May 10, 1898, announced that men enlisted or reenlisted in the Regular Army during the war would be granted their discharges if desired at the close of the war; and Circular 45, Adjutant-General's Office, October 27, 1898, provided that privates of the hospital corps, who had been transferred from volunteer regiments, might be discharged if they so requested at the time their respective regiments were mustered out.

By June 30, 1898, the hospital corps had increased to 133 hospital stewards, 172 acting hospital stewards, and 2,940 privates, most of the privates having been gained by transfers from the line. November 30, 1898, the corps attained its maximum strength—163 hospital stewards, 445 acting hospital stewards, and 5,980 privates, a total of 6,588. After this the force gradually decreased, mainly through the discharge of men enlisted for the war only, until on June 30, 1899, the force present was 189 hospital stewards, 287 acting hospital stewards, and 2,892 privates, a total of 3,368.

The gain to the corps during the fiscal year was 6,185—3,465 by enlistment and 2,720 by transfer. The loss aggregated 6,062 men, 5,086 of whom were discharged by order and only 201 by expiration of term of service. It is of interest to note that 106 died by disease, 4 were killed in action, 6 died of wounds, and 158 were discharged for disability.

For the year from April 30, 1898, to April 30, 1899, the gain to the corps by enlistment and transfer amounted to 8,016 men, while the gain for the year ending June 30, 1897, was only 276. The changes of status of members of the hospital corps in twelve months were increased nearly twenty-four fold on account of the war conditions; in fact, they were nearly as great as those occurring in the entire Army during the time of peace, for in the fiscal year 1896-97 the gain to the Army, exclusive of the hospital corps, amounted only to 8,748.

Paragraph 3, General Orders, No. 178, Adjutant-General's Office, November 8, 1898, allowed a volunteer regiment, in addition to the 3 regimental hospital stewards provided by law, 1 acting hospital steward, 6 privates of the hospital corps as attendants, 1 private as cook, and 1 for each ambulance and wagon, making an average allowance of 12 privates. This order was revoked by General Orders, No. 86, Adjutant-General's Office, May 2, 1899, most of the volunteer regiments having been by that time mustered out, and the allowance to a (regular) regiment serving without the United States was fixed at 1 hospital steward, 3 acting hospital stewards, and 12 privates.

Prior to the war there were in service 100 hospital stewards, the number provided by the act of March 16, 1896. This number was increased to 200, and the requirement of service for twelve months as acting hospital steward prior to appointment as hospital steward was suspended during the continuance of the

war. General Orders, No. 55, Adjutant-General's Office, May 31, 1896, gave authority to the commander of any army corps or of an independent division to appoint hospital stewards from acting hospital stewards, after three months' service, when they were recommended by their medical officers and approved by a board of not less than three medical officers. Under the provisions of this order 44 hospital stewards were appointed by corps commanders. In August, 1898, 13 acting hospital stewards were examined, under the direction of the Surgeon-General, of whom 10 were found qualified and immediately appointed, and in November 65 were examined, of whom 34 were appointed.

The act of March 3, 1899, authorized the increase of the Regular Army to 65,000. It was at first held that this act repealed the provisions of the act of March 1, 1887, which provided that the hospital corps should not be included in the effective strength of the Army, and that this corps was, therefore, included in the 65,000 men. An allowance was published in General Orders, No. 37, Adjutant-General's Office, March 9, 1899, fixing the number of hospital stewards at 175, acting hospital stewards at 325, and privates at 2,100, a total of 2,600 men, or 4 per cent of the total strength. It was, however, decided by the Judge-Advocate-General and the Comptroller of the Treasury that the provisions of the act of March 1, 1887, were not affected by this legislation, and that therefore the hospital corps was not included in the 65,000. This decision removed the limitation as to the number of acting hospital stewards and privates, but the number of hospital stewards, increased by the act of June 2, 1898, only during the existence of the war, reverted to that fixed by the act of March 16, 1896.

Ten hospital stewards were allowed each army corps by General Orders, No. 82, Adjutant-General's Office, June 27, 1898. The same order authorized the detachment of volunteer hospital stewards from their regiments and their assignment to duty at the discretion of corps commanders. By thus making use of the services of these men the needs of field and general hospitals for noncommissioned officers were in a measure supplied, but chief surgeons frequently reported on their inexperience and incapacity.

Acting hospital stewards.—Paragraph 1397, Army Regulations, which provides that a private must serve one year in the Hospital Corps before he can be detailed acting hospital steward, was so amended by paragraph 3, General Orders, No. 20, Adjutant-General's Office, January 27, 1899, as to require but three months' service as private previous to detail as acting hospital steward, because of the need of a greater number of these noncommissioned officers and the desirability of utilizing the services, in this capacity, of privates qualified to perform the duties by virtue of previous training in medicine, pharmacy, or nursing.

Paragraph 1409, Army Regulations, provides that at every post there will be at least one hospital steward, and at every post of two or more companies there will also be an acting steward, if practicable. The limited number of hospital stewards has, however, rendered it impossible to comply with this regulation. On June 30, 1899, there were in the United States 36 garrisoned posts, in Cuba 12, and in Porto Rico 13 posts with no hospital steward, the place of the stewards in these instances being taken by acting hospital stewards, on whom were imposed duties and responsibilities without corresponding rank and pay.

INSPECTOR-GENERAL.

The sphere of inquiry of the Inspector-General's department includes every branch of military affairs except when specially limited in Army Regulations and orders.

The Inspector-General, with his assistants, inspects all military commands, posts, stations, and camps; all depots, rendezvous, and recruiting stations, armories, arsenals, accounts, and business methods of all officers of the Army; all forts, arsenals, public works, fortifications, transports, national cemeteries; the unseizable public property for which Army officers may be accountable, with a view to its transfer, sale, or destruction; the military departments of all civil institutions of learning to which Army officers are detailed; the several branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, the United States Soldiers' Home, District of Columbia, and such other inspections and investigations as may be ordered by the Secretary of War and Commanding General of the Army.

During the two years ending June 30, 1900, there have been received in the Inspector-General's Office the following reports of inspections, viz:

Military posts.....	254
Armories, arsenals, depots, camps, etc.....	270
Recruiting rendezvous and stations.....	76
National cemeteries.....	67
Civil institutions of learning.....	93
Transports.....	60
Volunteer regiments.....	30
United States Military Academy.....	1
Special investigations.....	72

Among the special investigations was a thorough inspection, by the Inspector-General in person, of all matters immediately affecting the welfare of troops in Cuba and Porto Rico, occupying more than two months; and another, by one of his assistants, on the beef supplied during the Spanish war, engaging his attention uninterruptedly for more than three months.

During the year 1898-99 682 inspections of the accounts of disbursing officers, involving \$325,882,177.71, were made by officers of this Department, which is by far the largest amount inspected in any one fiscal year since these inspections were authorized by law in 1874, and may indicate one phase of the increased amount of work incident to the increased military establishment.

During the year ending June 30, 1900, 1,306 inspections of accounts were made, which accounts involved an expenditure of \$287,700,522.05.

Unseizable property.—The total number of inventory and inspection reports received during the year ending June 30, 1899, was 3,425, and 210, or 6 per cent, were made by officers of this department; 1,013, or 29 per cent, by officers assigned to the department as acting inspectors-general; 877, or 25 per cent, by inspectors-general of volunteers, and 1,325, or 39 per cent, by special inspectors.

Of the above inspections, 413 were made in Cuba, 182 in Porto Rico, 109 in the Philippines, and 4 in the Sandwich Islands.

During the year ending June 30, 1900, the total number of inventory and inspection reports received aggregated 3,621, of a value of \$10,009,897.93, while property of a value of \$8,689,350.88 was condemned, and that of a value of \$1,320,547.05 continued in service.

Public animals.—Six thousand seven hundred and thirty-seven public animals were offered for inspection during the year ending June 30, 1899, and 5,578 were condemned, and 1,159 retained in service. Many were sold without such inventory and inspection reports. If the law requires modification, so that a regular method can be adopted, the various methods resorted to during the Spanish war may illustrate some one way that can be accepted as best for all Government property. This aspect of the case was hardly decided during the previous investigations by Congress of the sale of property or its destruction when no longer needed.

The cavalry horses offered for inspection, included in the above figures, number 2,734; 2,427 were condemned and 307 retained in service.

In the volunteer service, 954 cavalry horses, aggregating \$83,400.38, the average price of which was \$88.47 when purchased, were eliminated from the service.

Total number of public animals inspected during the year ending June 30, 1900, was 2,748; total number condemned, 2,347; total number retained in service, 401. As the average cost of each animal is \$112, the total value of the animals inspected is \$307,776.

The condemnations of subsistence stores made during the year approximately cost, as shown in the reports received, \$91,089.99.

Among the condemnations since the beginning of the war to the 30th of June, 1899, are: Bacon, 410,808 pounds; beans, navy, 6,978 pounds; bread, hard, 102,661 pounds; 244 cases and 304 boxes; corn meal, 11,558 pounds; crackers, 2,153 pounds; flour, 406,820 pounds and 5 sacks; macaroni, 15,888 pounds; oatmeal, 4,204 pounds; onions, 87,160 pounds; pork, 10,988 pounds; potatoes, 271,853 pounds; rice, 3,834 pounds; sugar, 30,695 pounds; tomatoes, 117,842 cans of different sizes; probably considerably more was disposed of which never got on an inspection report.

Nine hundred inspection reports, in 147 volunteer organizations, of property for which officers directly connected with these organizations were accountable, were received during the year, and property which approximated in value \$363,550.67 was eliminated from the service. Four hundred and eighty-six of these inspections were made by inspectors-general of volunteers, 361 by special inspectors, 46 by acting inspectors-general, and 7 by the regular inspectors of the Department.

Two hundred and two inspections of engineer property were received to June 30, 1899, 4 by inspectors-general of volunteer, 16 by regular inspectors, 60 by special inspectors, and 122 by acting inspectors-general. Last year 168 inspections were made, all by officers connected with this Department.

The total value of subsistence stores condemned during the year ending June 30, 1900, is about \$290,000.

INSURRECTION.

Prior to February 4, 1899, the insurgents, under the leadership of Aguinaldo, had formed a military cabal and instituted a so-called republican form of government. They had secured from various sources arms and ammunition, overthrew the Spanish garrisons existing throughout Luzon, with the exception of that of Manila. Their military lines were drawn very closely round the city, and considerable irritation and friction resulted therefrom after the Americans took possession of Manila.

There no longer exists doubt in the minds of the well informed that the purpose of Aguinaldo and his colleagues was to precipitate an insurrection against the sovereignty of the United States. Every effort was made by the commander of the American forces and the officers and soldiers constituting his command to avoid any overt acts which might result in hostilities. Under the conditions which existed it was impracticable, however, to prolong the strained relations for any length of time. On the night of February 4 hostilities were commenced through efforts of the insurgents to cross the American picket lines, thereby drawing the fire of a sentry, and a general engagement thereupon immediately began.

On February 15 the insurgent government at Malolos issued a proclamation giving directions for the assassination and extermination of all individuals, without regard to race, with the exception of Philippine families.

The history of the insurrection, from its inception on the date above mentioned, is now a matter of general information.

JUDGE-ADVOCATE-GENERAL.

The Judge-Advocate-General is directed by law to "receive, review, and cause to be recorded the proceedings of all courts-martial, courts of inquiry, and military commissions." He also furnishes the Secretary of War information and advice relating to lands under control of the War Department and reports and opinions upon legal questions arising under the laws, regulations, and customs pertaining to the Army, and upon questions arising under the civil law; reports upon applications for clemency in the cases of military prisoners; examines and prepares legal papers relating to the erection of bridges over navigable waters; drafts bonds and examines those given to the United States by disbursing officers, colleges, and others; examines, revises, and drafts charges and specifications against officers and soldiers, and also drafts and examines deeds, contracts, licenses, leases, and legal papers generally.

Year ending June 30, 1899.

Commissioned officers tried by general court-martial:

Regulars (convicted).....	3
Volunteers (convicted, 47; acquitted, 20; sentence disapproved, 11).....	78
Cadets tried by general court-martial (convicted).....	5
Enlisted men tried by general court-martial:	
Regulars (convicted, 2,359; acquitted, 248; sentences disapproved, 70).....	2,677
Volunteers (convicted, 2,405; acquitted, 847; sentences disapproved, 265).....	3,017
Civilians tried by general court-martial:	
Those serving with Army in the field (convicted, 3; acquitted, 3).....	6
Discharged men held as general prisoners (convicted).....	2
Total trials by general court-martial.....	5,788

	Regulars.	Volunteers.	Limit of confinement.
Surrendered:			Months.
After an absence of not more than 30 days..	6	8	12
After an absence of more than 30 days.....	82	12	15
Apprehended:			
In service not more than 6 months at time of desertion.....	70	86	18
In service more than 6 months.....	66	8	30
Total number of desertions.....	174	114	
Average limit of confinement....months..	22.34	18.42	

In connection with this table it is to be observed that the limits of punishment are prescribed for "time of peace" only.

The number of men sentenced to dishonorable discharge in the Regular Army was 975, and in the Volunteer Army 644. Total, 1,619.

Death sentences were imposed in 5 cases on conviction of murder, 4 of the trials being by court-martial and 1 by military commission, but the sentence in each case was commuted by the President to life imprisonment, with dishonorable discharge and forfeiture of all pay and allowances added in the cases of soldiers. Three of the trials by court-martial were of enlisted men and the remaining one of a civilian packer in the employ of the Quartermaster's Department. The trial by a military commission was of a native of Porto Rico for the murder of a soldier.

The records of military commissions received during the year show that 82 persons were tried, of which number 45 were convicted, 35 were acquitted, and the sentences in two cases were disapproved.

LAS GUASIMAS.

Las Guasimas is the name of the location where was fought the first battle between Spanish and American troops on Cuban soil. The engagement took place on June 24, 1896, when 964 officers and men of the U.S. Army, under command of Maj. Gen. Joseph Wheeler, U. S. Volunteers, met and defeated several thousand Spaniards, under command of Gen. Vara del Rey, in a position chosen

by them and strongly protected by barbed wire entanglements and other defenses. This place is only a few miles distant from the city of Santiago de Cuba, and is situated on the main road leading thereto from the coast.

LIEUTENANT-GENERAL COMMANDING THE ARMY.

The Commanding General of the Army has supervision over the military establishment, and is charged with the discipline and efficiency of the Army, and all orders issued to the Army are promulgated in his name.

He is president of the Board of Commissioners, Soldiers' Home, and of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

The Medical Corps of the Army consists of 1 Surgeon-General with the rank of brigadier-general, 6 assistant surgeons-general with the rank of colonel, 10 deputy surgeons-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, 50 surgeons with the rank of major, and 125 assistant surgeons with the rank of captain and first lieutenant; in all, 192 commissioned medical officers.

This Medical Corps was found to be scarcely adequate for our Army of 25,000 men before the Spanish-American war. The enlarged Army authorized by Congress calls for a greatly increased force of medical officers. Every volunteer regiment has a surgeon and two assistant surgeons, and by authority of law there are now in service 34 surgeons of volunteers with the rank of major and over 400 contract doctors. This large number of medical officers is made necessary by the fact that in addition to our troops in the Philippines there are at present 153 independent posts having garrisons. These are located within the United States, in Cuba, Porto Rico, and Hawaii. A number of these posts require two or more medical officers.

The principal functions of the Medical Department are to care for the sick, to exercise sanitary supervision over troops in garrison or in the field, and to examine applicants for enlistment for the purpose of ascertaining their physical qualifications.

Medical supplies are purchased and issued under the supervision of the Surgeon-General of the Army, by medical officers detailed in charge of supply depots. The principal medical supply depots are located in New York City, St. Louis, Savannah, San Francisco, Habana, Santiago, San Juan, and Manila. From these supply depots all general and post hospitals and troops in the field are supplied with everything necessary for the comfort and medical treatment of the sick and wounded of our armies, including medicines, antiseptics and disinfectants, hospital stores, microscopical apparatus, surgical instruments, appliances and dressings, hospital furniture and bedding, together with a long list of miscellaneous articles required for use in general and post hospitals.

General hospitals and hospital ships are under the control of the Surgeon-General, who communicates his instructions directly to the surgeon in charge. But the Surgeon-General has no direct authority over medical officers on duty with troops in garrison or in the field. In each military department a chief surgeon, who is a member of the staff of the general commanding, exercises supervision over matters pertaining to the Medical Department.

The expenditures by the Medical Department of the Army during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, amounted to \$3,256,589.59.

On June 30, 1899, there were in the service 191 medical officers, the number allowed by law being 192.

Surgeons United States Volunteers.—During the year 140 officers of the United States Volunteers were appointed, 11 as lieutenant-colonels and 129 as majors, in the Medical Department. Forty-five of the appointees were from the Regular Army and 95 from civil life. At the end of the year there remained in service 34 majors and surgeons, 12 of whom were captains in the regular establishment.

Contract surgeons.—On July 1, 1898, 156 surgeons were on duty under contract and 784 contracts were made during the year, making a total of 940. Of this total 546 contracts were annulled during the year, including 8 on June 30, 1899, and 9 contract surgeons died while in service, leaving 385 under contract on July 1, 1899.

Expenditures during fiscal year ended June 30, 1900.

"NATIONAL DEFENSE (WAR)," ACT OF MARCH 9, 1898.

Allotment by the President, April 16, 1898:	
Balance on hand July 1, 1899	\$5.51
Balance on hand June 30, 1900	5.51
Reallotment by the President, September 8, 1898:	
Balance on hand July 1, 1899	1,679.78
Refundments during year	51.00
Total to be accounted for	1,730.78
Disbursed during year	138.19
Balance in United States Treasury June 30, 1900	1,592.59
Total	1,730.78
Allotment by the President, October 6, 1898:	
Balance July 1, 1899	44,521.89
Refundments during year	194.58
Total to be accounted for	44,716.47
Disbursed during year	19,849.83
Transferred by Treasury Department to adjust appropriations	742.01
Balance in United States Treasury June 30, 1900	24,124.63
Total	44,716.47
Allotment by the President, November 22, 1898:	
Balance on hand July 1, 1899	26,236.30
Refunded during year	12.00
Total to be accounted for	26,248.30
Disbursed during year	4,766.62
Balance June 30, 1900:	
In United States Treasury	\$13,153.26
In hands disbursing officer, Washington, D. C.	8,328.42
Total	21,481.68
Total	26,248.30

"MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT, JANUARY 1, 1899."

Balance on hand July 1, 1899, acts of May 4, 1898, June 8, 1898, July 7, 1898 (net)	\$84,918.66
Refunded during year	24,895.63
Total to be accounted for	29,814.29
Disbursed during year	3,293.05
Balance June 30, 1900:	
In United States Treasury	\$25,991.71
In hands disbursing officer, Manila, P. I.	529.58
Total	26,521.24
Total	29,814.29

"MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT, 1898."

Balance on hand July 1, 1899, act of March 2, 1897	\$366.18
Refunded during year	14.37
Total to be accounted for	380.55
Disbursed during year	365.77
Transferred to surplus fund	14.78
Total	380.55

"MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT, 1899."

Balances on hand July 1, 1899, acts of March 15, 1898, January 5, 1899, March 3, 1899	\$1,454,151.99
Refunded during year	7,071.44
Gain on exchange	19.36
Total to be accounted for	1,461,242.79
Disbursed during year	551,325.81
Transferred by Treasury Department to other appropriations	24,835.28
Transferred by act of Congress approved February 9, 1900, to "Medical and Hospital Department, 1901"	500,000.00
Balance on hand June 30, 1900:	
In United States Treasury	\$349,837.31
In hands of disbursing officers:	
Washington, D. C.	27,946.97
Manila, P. I.	7,297.42
Total	385,081.70
Total	1,461,242.79

"MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT, 1900."

Appropriated by act of Congress approved March 3, 1899	\$1,500,000.00
Appropriated by act of Congress approved February 9, 1900	500,000.00
Gain on exchange	2,000,000.00
Refundments during year	12.50
Total to be accounted for	2,000,437.04
Disbursed during year	\$1,549,141.09
Transferred by Treasury Department to adjust appropriations	5,719.51
Balance June 30, 1900:	
In United States Treasury	337,239.56
In hands of disbursing officers:	
New York	\$34,922.17
Washington	15,083.34
St. Louis	14,427.01
San Francisco	11,824.37
Habana, Cuba	1,636.83
Santiago, Cuba	405.41
San Juan, P. R.	2,668.08
Ponce, P. R.	2,655.95
Honolulu, H. I.	1,628.18
St. Michael, Alaska	4,902.60
Manila, P. I.	17,491.47
Iloilo, P. I.	603.93
Aparri, P. I.	31.54
Cebu, P. I.	93.67
Hospital ship Relief	1.33
Total	108,336.88
Total	445,576.44
Total	2,000,437.04

A BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE WORK PERFORMED BY THE MILITARY INFORMATION DIVISION SINCE THE DECLARATION OF WAR WITH SPAIN.

Since the declaration of war with Spain, in April, 1898, the Military Information Division has been busily engaged in the preparation and publication of books, notes, and pamphlets on various military subjects, and maps, tracings and blue prints relating to Cuba, Porto Rico, the Philippines, Alaska, Africa, Guam, China, etc. The work of preparation and distribution of the many publications—some 29 in number—and maps, etc., to the Army, to members of Congress, to universities and colleges having military departments, and to applicants from all parts of the country and abroad, have kept the small force constantly engaged.

In addition to the regular office translations and calls for translations from the different bureaus of the War Department, a great many translations have been made of Spanish law books, etc., for publication. These Spanish translations engaged the services of the entire force of translators for about six months, and was a work of considerable magnitude. It should be borne in mind that most of the periodicals and publications received in the Military Information Division

* Actual balances as shown by the books of this office, \$12,715.27, of which \$7,796.61 was pledged to honor drafts made by the medical disbursing officer in the Philippine Islands on the Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation, under a letter of credit issued in his favor. These drafts were paid by the bank and the proceeds thereof were accounted for during the year ending June 30, 1899, as disbursed by that officer or in his possession June 30, 1899. The bank was reimbursed by the Treasury Department in August, 1899.

† Balance as reported by Surgeon-General October 12, 1899, \$1,448,387.37; found subsequently to be erroneous, the balance June 30 having been cabled incorrectly from Manila, P. I.

‡ May 31, 1900, last report.

are published in foreign languages and necessarily have to be translated before their information becomes generally available for ready reference. The reports from our military attachés abroad have been entered and carded, and the information furnished made available for quick reference. The accounts for purchases and expenses have been received, examined, and forwarded to the Auditor for adjustment. A special feature of the recent work of the division has been the preparation and distribution of the Notes on China, Map of Northeastern China, and Map of the Pei-Ho.

The map section has prepared over 200 maps, sketches, and tracings—some of them containing several sheets (plan of defense of Habana 46 sheets) since April, 1898. Of these maps some 17 have been published and distributed to the Army, etc. In addition to these, a number of pen sketches and drawings on military subjects of various kinds have been made.

The photographic section has been engaged in the reproduction of maps, etc., for current use, requiring the making of thousands of negatives and prints of different sizes up to 34 inches square, and supplying from one to many prints of each of the negatives on velox, bromide, or blue-print papers, and bromide enlargements up to 7 feet long. As an instance of this kind of work, it may be stated that there was made an enlarged sectional map of Porto Rico on a scale of 1.5 inches to 1 mile, consisting of 75 sections, each section representing an area of 64 square miles, besides enlarging and reducing to the same scale numerous road sketches of different parts of the island. This section has also been engaged in making copies and enlargements of photographs for the War Atlas (a photographic history of the military operations during the Spanish-American war), one section of which is well under way. In fact, over a thousand negatives of various sizes have been made, and from these and other negatives about 10,000 prints of different kinds have been made.

The division was entrusted with the duty of examining a vast amount of Spanish mail, both official and private, captured on board prize vessels.

A large number of maps and books have been purchased from abroad and added to the files and reference library of the division.

Militia force of United States.

	Organized strength.								
	Commissioned officers.					Enlisted men.			
	Generals.	General staff.	Regimental field and staff.	Company.	Total.	Noncommissioned officers.	Musicians.	Privates.	Aggregate.
Generals and general staff.	56	748	804	85	109	194
Engineers.....	5	14	19	14	1	247	262	281
Cavalry.....	93	235	328	883	112	3,160	4,155	4,483
Artillery (heavy).....	24	57	81	226	29	779	1,034	1,115
Light batteries.....	69	224	293	778	106	2,938	3,822	4,115
Machine-gun batteries.....	17	17	55	5	152	212	229
Infantry.....	1,683	4,235	5,918	15,361	2,673	69,800	87,894	93,812
Signal corps.....	3	40	43	164	4	398	566	609
Hospital and ambulance corps.....	7	11	18	113	2	564	679	697
Grand aggregate.....	56	748	1,894	4,833	7,521	17,670	3,041	78,098	98,818

MILITARY COMMISSION OF SANTIAGO.

The Spanish general, Toral, who, during the illness of Lieutenant-General Linare, commanded the Spanish forces in the province of Santiago de Cuba, having, on July 14, 1898, agreed with General Shafter to appoint a joint commission to discuss the terms and conditions of a surrender of the Spanish forces in said province, the commissioners named were as follows:

For the United States.—Commissioners, Maj. Gen. Joseph Wheeler, U. S. V.; Maj. Gen. H. W. Lawton, U. S. V.; Lieut. J. D. Miley, Fourth Artillery, aid-de-camp; secretary, Mr. Leonard Wilson, United States War Department; interpreters, Mr. R. G. Mendoza, Cuban volunteers, aid; Mr. A. E. Mestre, Cuban volunteers, aid.

For the Kingdom of Spain.—Commissioners, Brig. Gen. Don Federico Escario, Lieut. Col. of Staff Don Ventura Frontan; interpreter, Mr. Robert Mason, British vice-consul.

The commission held its meetings under an enormous ceiba tree situated midway between the Spanish and American lines, and, after deliberating under a flag of truce for three days, the surrender was eventually arranged and formally took place at noon on July 17, 1898.

MILITARY COMMISSIONERS, CUBA.

Maj. Gen. J. F. Wade, chairman; Rear-Admiral William T. Sampson; Maj. Gen. M. C. Butler; Lieut. Col. John W. Clous, secretary; Captain Hart, interpreter; Acting Assistant Surgeon Laine, medical officer.

MILITARY COMMISSIONERS, PORTO RICO.

Maj. Gen. John R. Brooke, chairman; Rear-Admiral W. S. Schley; Brig. Gen. W. W. Gordon; Lieut. Col. Edward Hunter, secretary and recorder.

MILITARY TELEGRAPH LINES.

	Miles.
In United States, June 30, 1900, aggregated in length about.....	900
In Cuba, June 30, 1900, operated by Signal Corps, aggregated in length about.....	3,256
In Porto Rico:	
Telegraph lines.....	381
Telephone lines.....	110
In Philippine Islands, telegraph lines.....	2,639

In addition there are 160 miles of telephone line and 210 miles of cable maintained and operated by the Signal Corps in the Philippine Islands.

During the Spanish-American war there were 168 miles of cable laid by the Signal Corps and about 1,000 miles of land line constructed.

Number of Signal Corps stations maintained in—

Cuba.....	41
Porto Rico.....
Philippines.....	275
United States.....	49

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE EQUIPMENT.

During the year 1899 over 800 telephones, complete, have been procured and distributed in Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, and complete instrumental equipment for 50 telephone offices have been placed in the Philippines alone. In the larger centers, such as Cuba and Manila, where the old forms of batteries are unsuited, steps are being taken to supplant battery power by dynamos, storage

batteries, and rotary transformers, in accordance with the present practice of the best commercial telegraph companies.

While military lines are constructed and maintained primarily for administrative purposes of the army, yet they also subserve commercial interests. It is not to be expected that any degree of accuracy can be observed in keeping account of the volume of business done on these lines, but the following statement is based on partial reports received:

Number of messages sent and received on military lines in Porto Rico by Signal Corps during year ending June 30, 1900.....	232,771
Number of messages sent and received on military lines in Cuba by Signal Corps during year ending June 30, 1900.....	245,470
Number of messages sent and received on military lines in Philippines by Signal Corps during year ending June 30, 1900.....	1,025,400

The tremendous amount of business handled in the Philippines is due to the fact that the Signal Corps has constructed a very extensive telegraph and telephone system there, and a large part of official communication between various bodies of the Army is conducted by wire. A message may only consist of half a dozen words or may comprise several hundred; a fair average would be about 30 words to a message.

NURSES.

Contract nurses.

The value of the services of female nurses has been recognized in a practical way by most military nations since the time of the Crimean war, when Miss Florence Nightingale and her corps of patriotic women aided in caring for the sick and wounded in the hospitals at Scutari. In the armies of Europe provision is made for the assignment of a certain number of trained female nurses, or sisters of religious orders, at large permanent military hospitals; and since the Geneva convention the nurses furnished by the National Red Cross and other aid societies have served in time of war in hospitals at the base of military operations.

During our civil war female nurses, many of them Sisters of Charity, served at many of the large general hospitals. A few who had special ability, intelligence, and experience were employed in nursing particular cases; but male help was preferred in the general wards, and the sphere of the women was usually restricted to the extra diets and supervision over the linen, the laundry, and the contribution room.

Since then, however, the systematically educated and trained female nurse has been developed by the medical profession to insure expert attendance on the patient during the absence of the physician or surgeon. There is a large number of such educated women in the United States at the present time, and they did not hesitate to offer their services to the Government during the recent war.

The emergency which rendered their services acceptable was the product of two causes: First, the inability of the Medical Department of the Army to enlist in a few weeks 6,000 or more men qualified by previous experience to perform certain important duties, or indeed to enlist that number of inexperienced but intelligent men, with the intention of training them subsequently; second, the epidemic prevalence of typhoid fever in our camps.

Trained nurses were required to care for the large number of sick in these hospitals. The Hospital Corps had in its membership many men whose services were invaluable at this time, but there was not a sufficient number of such men for the occasion.

I had already as early as May 10 made contracts with female nurses for service in general hospitals, and in July many were on duty in the hospitals of General Shafter's army at Santiago de Cuba. During the prevalence of typhoid fever in our camps I increased the number of female nurses and placed them on duty, not only in the general hospitals, but in the division and post hospitals and in such regimental hospitals as required their services. The number reached a maximum of 1,158 on September 15. After this date the suppression of the typhoid epidemic and the muster out of volunteer regiments rendered so large a nursing force unnecessary. Contracts were annulled, and on July 1, 1899, there remained in service only 202—65 in the United States, 76 in Cuba, 9 in Porto Rico, 38 in the Philippines, 6 in Honolulu, and 8 on the hospital ship *Relief*. The total number of female nurses with whom contracts were made was 1,563. Among them there were reported 140 cases of typhoid fever; 12 fatal. One nurse died of yellow fever.

American women may well feel proud of the record made by these nurses in 1898-99, for every medical officer with whom they served has testified to their intelligence and skill, their earnestness, devotion, and self-sacrifice.

The contract nurses now in service have been organized into a female nurse corps under the superintendence of Acting Asst. Surg. Anita Newcomb McGee. The corps consists of chief nurses, nurses, and reserve nurses.

OFFICERS OF THE ARMY.

(See Strength of the Army; Casualties in action; General officers.)

Number of officers commissioned in the Volunteer Army from April 1, 1898, to June 30, 1900, was 3,317.

New appointments to the Army from April 1, 1898, to June 30, 1900.

Brigadier-general.....	1
Quartermaster's Department.....	1
Medical Department.....	54
Pay Department.....	11
Engineer Corps.....	17
Record and Pension Office.....	9
Chaplains.....	9
Infantry arm.....	450
Cavalry arm.....	67
Artillery arm.....	115
Total.....	706

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

The duties of the Ordnance Department consist in providing, preserving, distributing, and accounting for every description of artillery, small arms, and all the munitions of war which may be required for the fortresses of the country, the armies in the field, and for the whole body of the militia of the Union. In these duties are comprised that of determining the general principles of construction and of prescribing in detail the models and forms of all military weapons employed in war. They comprise also the duty of prescribing the regulations for the proof and inspection of all these weapons, for maintaining uniformity and economy in their fabrication, for insuring their good quality, and for their preservation and distribution.

The organization of the Ordnance Department comprises 66 officers and 500 enlisted men. The officers consist of 1 Chief of Ordnance with the rank of brigadier-general, 4 colonels, 5 lieutenant-colonels, 12 majors, 24 captains, 17 first lieutenants, and 1 ordnance storekeeper with the rank of major. These officers are distributed at 26 stations, and are employed in the office of the Chief of Ordnance at Washington, at the various arsenals and ordnance depots throughout this country and in the lately acquired foreign possessions, at the United States Military Academy, at the Sandy Hook proving ground, at private powder works, and on inspection duty at the works of contractors for heavy guns and carriages and of projectiles. In many instances the officers at the ordnance posts also perform inspection duty at points in the vicinity, and the officers on inspection duty in cities are frequently required to inspect work at considerable distances from

their regular stations. The enlisted men of the department are distributed at the various arsenals, principally for purposes of guard and police, the detachments numbering from 12 to 82 men, in accordance with the comparative importance of the arsenals.

Ordnance and ordnance stores.

This term includes every article issued by the Ordnance Department—guns, carriages, ammunition, infantry equipments, horse equipments, materials for repair and preservation of stores, etc.

The following representative articles were manufactured or purchased from the date of the declaration of war, April 25, 1898, to June 30, 1900:

Magazine rifles.....	174,139
Magazine carbines.....	10,151
Revolvers.....	17,450
Machetes.....	6,096
Sets of infantry equipments.....	287,500
Sets of horse equipments.....	35,000
Cartridge belts.....	613,226
Rifle-ball cartridges.....	137,839,015
Revolver-ball cartridges.....	5,650,400

Ordnance and ordnance stores have been issued to the Philippine Islands, consisting of field and siege guns, machine guns, automatic and mountain guns, with their carriages, implements, equipments, and ammunition therefor, complete; also, small arms and necessary ammunition therefor, infantry and horse equipments, cavalry accouterments, and large quantities of miscellaneous stores.

Statement of guns mounted and of guns in process of manufacture, for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1898, 1899, and 1900.

	8-inch.	10-inch.	12-inch.	12-inch mortars.	Rapid-fire.
Guns mounted, year ending June 30—					
1898.....	67	82	18	217	4
1899.....	81	110	61	276	47
1900.....	81	118	85	344	319
Guns under construction, June 30—					
1898.....	92	136	94	320	346
1899.....	92	141	134	358	377
1900.....	92	141	134	358	397

PAYMASTER-GENERAL.

The Paymaster-General is charged with the payment of the officers and enlisted men of the Army and civil employees of the Department; with furnishing funds to his officers and seeing that they duly account for the same, and with a preliminary examination of their accounts; also with the payment of Treasury certificates for bounty, back pay, etc., and balance due deceased officers and soldiers of the Volunteer and Regular Army.

Pay of Army.

Payments made to Regular and Volunteer armies engaged during Spanish-American war, from April 21, 1898, to April 11, 1899, \$67,065,629.56.

Report for fiscal year ending June 30, 1898.

On July 1, 1897, officers of the Pay Department were charged with public funds aggregating.....	\$598,883.29
During fiscal year 1898 these officers received—	
From the United States Treasury.....	22,117,948.49
From soldiers' deposits.....	613,513.51
From army paymasters' collections.....	169,624.18
Total balances and receipts.....	23,499,969.47
Accounted for as follows:	
Expended on account of pay of the Army.....	14,632,569.64
Expended on account of pay of the Army (United States Volunteers).....	1,519,150.64
Expended on account of pay of the Army (national defense).....	5,000.00
Expended on account of mileage to officers.....	103,201.80
Expended on account of mileage to officers (national defense).....	37,021.94
Expended on account of pay of Military Academy.....	300,321.99
Expended on account of volunteers (Treasury certificates).....	437,341.28
Surplus funds deposited to credit of United States Treasurer.....	1,205,366.42
Army paymasters' collections deposited to credit of United States Treasurer.....	169,624.18
Balances charged officers June 30, 1898.....	5,090,371.58
Total.....	23,499,969.47

Report for fiscal year ending June 30, 1899.

On July 1, 1898, officers of the Pay Department were charged with public funds aggregating.....	\$5,090,371.58
During the fiscal year 1899 these officers received—	
From the United States Treasury.....	84,148,099.76
From soldiers' deposits.....	1,496,762.31
From army paymasters' collections.....	1,220,311.10
Total balances and receipts.....	91,955,544.75
Accounted for as follows:	
Expended on account of pay of the Army.....	34,141,225.30
Expended on account of pay of the Army (United States Volunteers).....	35,877,177.57
Expended on account of extra pay to Regular Army, war with Spain.....	202,592.92
Expended on account of extra pay to volunteers, war with Spain.....	1,443,932.66
Expended on account of mileage to officers.....	403,173.94
Expended on account of mileage to officers (national defense).....	177,640.28
Expended on account of pay of Military Academy.....	288,362.09
Expended on account of volunteers (Treasury certificates).....	822,125.86
Expended on account of emergency fund, War Department, "to disband the Cuban army".....	905,100.00
Surplus funds deposited to credit of United States Treasurer.....	7,296,776.59
Army paymasters' collections deposited to credit of United States Treasurer.....	1,220,311.10
Balances charged officers June 30, 1899.....	9,682,126.44
Total.....	91,955,544.75

Additional paymasters.

The increase in the Army necessitated an increase in the force of the pay corps to enable the Department to make prompt payments; therefore, on the request of the Paymaster-General, the President had, on June 30, 1898, increased the corps by 72 additional paymasters.

These officers and their clerks entered the service with very little or no knowledge or experience in regard to army accounts, and it appeared necessary to place them under instruction to fit them for their duties.

Accordingly, a school of instruction was organized, in which each was made familiar with the necessary forms to be used in payments, and the principles of making and rendering accounts. Attention was also directed to orders, regulations, etc., governing the payment of accounts. As a result, each officer entered upon his duties with a fair knowledge of the business before him.

During the fiscal year 1899 the officers of the Pay Department of the Army traveled 416,149 miles, paid off 1,872 posts, and made total payments aggregating \$73,756,330.62.

PHILIPPINES.

The Philippine group, lying off the southern coast of Asia, between longitude 120 and 130 and latitude 5 and 20, approximately, number about 2,000 islands, great and small in a land and sea area of 1,200 miles of latitude and 2,400 miles of longitude. The actual land area is about 115,300 miles. The island of Luzon, on which the capital city (Manila) is situated, is the largest member of the group, being about the size of the State of New York. The estimates of population vary from 7,000,000 to 10,000,000. The country has been in the possession of Spain since 1565. There is but one railway on the islands, which is 123 miles long. Tobacco and coffee are the chief products.

Manila Bay was, on May 1, 1898, the scene of a great naval battle between the Asiatic Squadron of the United States under command of Commodore Dewey and the Spanish fleet, in which the latter was completely destroyed. On the arrival of the United States troops shortly afterwards the city of Manila capitulated after a short resistance. By the terms of the treaty of peace these islands were ceded to the United States on the payment to Spain of the sum of \$20,000,000.

PORTO RICO.

The island of Porto Rico is the most eastern of the Greater Antilles in the West Indies, and is separated on the east from the Danish island of St. Thomas by a distance of about 50 miles. Its distance from New York is 1,420 miles.

The island is a parallelogram in general outline, 108 miles from the east to the west, and from 37 to 43 miles across.

The area of Porto Rico, including the adjacent and dependent islands of Vieques, Culebra, Mona, and Muertos, has been found to be 3,606 square miles. But owing to the imperfect surveys on which all maps of Porto Rico are based there must be a considerable and indeterminate margin of possible error in any such measurement. The island is about three times the size of Long Island, which was, in 1890, perhaps the largest insular division of the United States. It is also slightly greater than the eastern shore of Maryland (3,461 square miles).

The relative sizes of the larger West Indies are as follows: Cuba, the greatest, is about equal in area to all the rest combined; Haiti, the second, is about two-thirds the size of Cuba, while, on the other hand, it is seven times the size of Jamaica and eight times the size of Porto Rico; Porto Rico, again, is more than double the size of the fifth island, Trinidad, which is itself about three times the size of the sixth island, Guadeloupe.

The area, population, and density of population of the seven departments of Porto Rico are given below:

Department.	Area in square miles.	Population October 16, 1899.	Persons to a square mile.
Guayama.....	561	111,986	200
Humacao.....	413	88,501	214
Ponce.....	822	203,191	247
Arecibo.....	621	162,308	261
Bayamon.....	542	160,046	295
Mayaguez.....	407	127,566	313
Aguadilla.....	240	99,645	415
Porto Rico.....	3,606	953,243	264

The population of Porto Rico shown by the schedules of the present census taken with reference to the date of October 16, 1899, was 953,243. This was about nine-tenths of the population of Maryland in 1890, the State whose population is nearest to that of Porto Rico. Previous censuses of the island in comparison with the present have shown the following results:

Date of census.	Population of Porto Rico.
December 25, 1860.....	583,308
December 31, 1877.....	731,648
December 31, 1887.....	798,565
December 31, 1897.....	899,439
October 16, 1899.....	953,243

Porto Rico has 264 persons to a square mile. This density of population is about the same as in Massachusetts, twice that in New York State, and thrice that in Ohio. It is more than seven times that of Cuba, and not much less than twice that of Habana province.

The table puts in a clear light the slight difference between the various departments. Aguadilla has hardly more than twice as many people to a square mile as Guayama. In Cuba, on the contrary, Habana province has over nineteen times as many people to a square mile as Puerto Principe. This remarkable evenness of settlement in Porto Rico extends to the sixty-nine municipal districts. The least-settled district has 58 persons to a square mile, or about the same number as Indiana. The densities of these districts range about 264, the density for the island, and depart from it by an average amount of 106 units, or 40 per cent of that number.

It is traversed from east to west by a mountain range dividing the island into two unequal portions. The interior is covered with vast forests. The chief port on the north coast is the capital, San Juan.

Porto Rico is unusually fertile, and its dominant industries are agriculture and lumbering. Large quantities of minerals are found. There are less than 150 miles of railroad on the island. The largest article of export is coffee.

After a short campaign by United States troops in July and August, 1898, which was brought to a sudden termination by the signing of the peace protocol, the

island was ceded to the United States under the terms of the treaty of peace, and the flag of the United States was raised in token of formal possession on October 18, 1898.

PRESIDENT.

The law provides that the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into the active service of the United States. As Commander in Chief he is authorized to direct the movements of the land and naval forces placed by law at his command, and to employ them in the manner he may deem most effectual to harass, conquer, and subdue the enemy. He may invade the hostile country, and subject it to the sovereignty and authority of the United States, but his conquests do not enlarge the boundaries of this Union, nor extend the operations of our institutions and laws beyond the limits before assigned to them by the legislative power.

By the rules of civilized warfare and the laws of nations, the commander of a belligerent force, engaged in the military occupation of invaded territory, is required to establish and maintain a government of civil affairs for the territory so occupied.

PROCLAMATIONS.

By President for 125,000 volunteers, April 23, 1898. (See Appendix 4.)
By President to people of Cuba. (See Appendix 7.)
By civil commissioners to the people of the Philippine Islands, April 4, 1899. (See Appendix 11.)
By President for 75,000 volunteers, May 25, 1898. (See Appendix 5.)
By President of peace protocol. (See Appendix 8.)
By President of treaty of peace. (See Appendix 12.)
By President establishing blockade on southern coast of Cuba and of San Juan, Porto Rico, June 27, 1898. (See Appendix 6.)
By President establishing blockade on north coast of Cuba, April 22, 1898. (See Appendix 2.)
By President with reference to maritime law, April 26, 1898. (See Appendix 3.)
By President placing Hawaiian Islands under control of Navy Department, December 23, 1898.

PRISONERS OF WAR.

The cost of returning the prisoners from the Philippines incurred during the year 1898-99 has amounted to \$908,583.75.

Estimated number of Filipinos killed, wounded, and captured.

	Killed.	Wounded.	Captured and surrendered.
June 4, 1900.....	10,780	2,104	10,425

Filipino prisoners in possession of United States, about 2,000.
Captured by Navy..... 701
Cost of transportation of 22,864 from Cuba to Spain..... \$613,860.00
Cost of transportation of 8,086 from the Philippines to Spain..... 740,276.25
General Otis advised the War Department, May 17, 1899, that 12,598 Spaniards were repatriated from Philippine Islands from November 8, 1898, to May 6, 1899.

QUARTERMASTER-GENERAL.

The Quartermaster-General, aided by assistants, provides transportation for the Army, also clothing and equipage, horses, mules, and wagons, vessels, forage, stationery, and other miscellaneous quartermaster stores and property for the Army, and of clothing and equipage for the militia; constructs necessary buildings, wharves, roads, and bridges at military posts, and repairs the same; furnishes water, heating, and lighting apparatus; pays guides, spies, and interpreters, and is in charge of national cemeteries.

Statement of approximate number of rations issued during Spanish-American war.

Month ending—	Enlisted strength of Army.			Number of days.	Number of rations.
	Regulars.	Volunteers.	Aggregate strength.		
May 31, 1898.....	36,625	118,555	155,180	31	4,810,580
June 30, 1898.....	45,669	153,210	198,879	30	5,966,370
July 31, 1898.....	51,721	202,841	254,563	31	7,891,453
August 31, 1898.....	54,039	207,361	261,400	31	8,103,400
September 30, 1898.....	57,325	199,805	257,130	30	7,713,900
October 31, 1898.....	58,310	157,612	215,922	31	6,698,582
November 30, 1898.....	61,444	110,202	171,646	30	5,149,380
December 31, 1898.....	63,370	98,481	161,851	31	5,017,381
January 31, 1899.....	63,223	85,938	149,161	31	4,623,991
February 28, 1899.....	57,684	66,181	123,865	28	3,468,220
March 31, 1899.....	61,110	47,586	108,696	31	3,369,576
April 30, 1899.....	60,804	28,277	89,081	30	2,672,430
Total approximate number of rations.....					65,480,263

The approximate value would be at estimated cost of 25 cents per ration: (65,480,263 × .25) = \$16,370,065.75.

RATIONS.

Under the authority of the Secretary of War of August 24 there have been purchased from subsistence funds by officers of the Subsistence Department and issued gratuitously to the troops at Montauk up to September 30, 1898, in addition to the ration and to the 60 cents per day provided by General Order 116, the following quantities of articles:

Ice.....	pounds..	1,065,200
Milk.....	gallons..	54,860
Halibut.....	pounds..	3,000
Lima beans.....	do.....	47,047
Ten.....	do.....	250
Apples (canned).....	3 pound cans..	6,020
Do.....	gallon cans..	1,774
Apples (evaporated).....	pounds..	21,550
Apricots (evaporated).....	do.....	14,500
Butter.....	do.....	34,799
Corn (canned).....	cans.....	13,889
Cocoa.....	pounds..	1,080
Lemons.....	crates..	150
Soda crackers.....	do.....	9,930
Eggs.....	dozens..	53,070
Ham (sugar-cured).....	do.....	19,927
Evaporated cream.....	cans.....	13,889
Oatmeal.....	do.....	31,140
Peaches (evaporated).....	do.....	18,025
Peaches (canned).....	do.....	14,923

Pears (canned).....	cans..	14,809
Pease (canned).....	do.....	16,128
Prunes.....	pounds..	9,925
Beef soup.....	cans..	7,500
Chicken soup.....	do.....	11,490
Pickles.....	gallons..	7,100
Oranges.....	crates..	300
Halibut.....	pounds..	2,100
Lima beans (in round numbers, 48,000).....	do.....	47,900
Ice, about.....	do.....	400,000
Evaporated apricots.....	do.....	21,000
Butter.....	do.....	21,000
Green corn.....	cans..	14,000
Cocoa.....	pounds..	1,000
Crackers.....	do.....	4,000
Sugar-cured hams.....	do.....	21,000
Evaporated cream.....	cans..	29,000
Oatmeal.....	pounds..	23,000
Peaches.....	do.....	15,000
Evaporated peaches.....	do.....	18,000
Canned pears.....	do.....	12,000
Canned pease.....	do.....	14,000
Prunes.....	do.....	10,000
Soup.....	cans..	20,000
Pickles.....	do.....	5,000
Oranges.....	boxes..	300
Eggs.....	dozen..	53,000
Tea.....	pounds..	250
Fresh milk.....	gallons..	28,000

RECORD AND PENSION OFFICE.

By the act of Congress approved May 9, 1892, establishing the Record and Pension Office as a bureau of the War Department, the chief of that office was charged with the custody, under the Secretary of War, of the military and hospital records of the volunteer armies and the transaction of the business of the War Department connected therewith. Prior to and during the progress of the war with Spain the work of the office consisted in the transaction of the business of the Department relating to the volunteer forces in service during the several wars in which the country had been engaged, including the Revolutionary war, the war of 1812, the various Indian wars, the war with Mexico, and the war of the rebellion. The records of the office embraced those of the Revolutionary armies and of the volunteer forces of all wars subsequent to the Revolution, the records of the Provost-Marshal-General's Bureau, those of the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands, and the archives of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Confederate Government.

In the act of April 22, 1898, under which the volunteer army in service during the war with Spain was created, it was provided that upon the disbandment of the volunteer and militia organizations the records pertaining to them, together with the reports of medical officers serving with the volunteer troops and the records kept by such officers, should be filed in the Record and Pension Office.

The work of the Record and Pension Office was largely augmented after the close of hostilities and the muster out of the volunteer forces by the receipt of the records of the disbanded organizations.

The muster out of the volunteer army was begun in September, 1898; the first medical records were received in December, 1898, and the transfer of the military records of the disbanded volunteer regiments, begun in January, 1899, was soon completed.

From January, 1899, to the close of the fiscal year, June 30, 1899, 11,394 calls were received from the Auditor for the War Department for military histories of officers and enlisted men in service during the war with Spain, and 4,141 similar calls were received from the Commissioner of Pensions. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1900, 44,741 such calls were received from the Auditor, and 29,700 from the Commissioner of Pensions.

These calls for the military histories of officers and enlisted men in service during the war with Spain have resulted in a very material increase in the work of the office. But a more material and perplexing increase of the work has resulted from the general correspondence relating to organizations and individuals of the volunteer forces in service during the Spanish war, involving, as it does, many questions which, owing to the legislation relative to organizations and individual service peculiar to that war, are new to the Department, and necessarily require careful consideration and administrative action.

The number of cases received and disposed of in the Record and Pension Office during the war with Spain and up to June 30, 1900, was as follows:

For the months of May and June, 1898:	
From the Pension Office.....	21,702
From the Auditor for the War Department.....	4,025
Remuster cases.....	902
Desertion cases.....	325
All other cases, miscellaneous.....	4,029
Total.....	31,783

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899:	
From the Pension Office.....	116,584
From the Auditor for the War Department.....	35,202
Remuster cases.....	3,605
Desertion cases.....	2,627
All other cases, miscellaneous.....	25,000
Total.....	183,018

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1900:	
From the Pension Office.....	132,627
From the Auditor for the War Department.....	59,481
Remuster cases.....	3,770
Desertion cases.....	2,381
All other cases, miscellaneous.....	65,397
Total.....	261,836

No separate record has been kept of the number of Spanish war cases received except of the calls from the Pension Office and the Auditor for the War Department for statements of military service. But, deducting from the total receipts for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1900, the average number of receipts for the preceding five years, it is shown that the excess of receipts for the last fiscal year was 79,386, which number fairly represents the increase for that year in the current work of the office resulting from the war with Spain.

As stated in a preceding paragraph, the number of military histories of officers and enlisted men in service during the war with Spain furnished the Commissioner of Pensions and the Auditor for the War Department by this office to June 30, 1900, was as follows:

From, January, 1899, to June 30, 1899:	
To the Commissioner of Pensions.....	4,144
To the Auditor for the War Department.....	11,394
Total.....	15,538

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1900:

To the Commissioner of Pensions..... 29,700
To the Auditor for the War Department..... 44,741
Total..... 74,441

It is proper to remark that the term "remuster cases," as used in the preceding tables, refers to cases arising under the act of Congress approved February 24, 1897, for the relief of certain officers and enlisted men of the volunteer forces in service during the war of the rebellion, and that the term "desertion cases," as used in the same tables, refers generally to applications for removal of the charge of desertion, under the act of March 2, 1899, in the case of soldiers of the Mexican war and the war of the rebellion. Neither of these acts of Congress has any application to officers or enlisted men of the war with Spain.

The cases classified in the tables as "miscellaneous" include applications for original discharge certificates, applications for certificates in lieu of lost discharges under the act of Congress approved March 3, 1873, applications for certificates of discharge in true name under the act of April 14, 1890, applications for recognition as veteran volunteers under reenlistments during the civil war, applications for medals of honor for ex-soldiers of the civil war, inquiries from the Commissary-General of Subsistence, the Quartermaster-General of the Army, the adjutants-general of States, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, the Comptroller of the Treasury, the Civil Service Commission, the Grand Army of the Republic, the Loyal Legion and kindred patriotic societies, the soldiers' homes, and the general correspondence of the office relative to organizations and individuals which can not be classified.

Shortly after the commencement of the Spanish war the Chief of the Record and Pension Office was assigned to duty as the successor of Brig. Gen. George W. Davis, U. S. V., president of the Board of Publication of the Rebellion Records, War Records Office, relieving him May 31, 1898. By July 1, 1898, the force employed in that office had been reduced to 22 employees—about one-third of its previous number. December 1, 1898, the Board of Publication was dissolved, the work of publication being thereafter carried on under the direction of the Chief of the Record and Pension Office. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899, 3 volumes were compiled, and together with 6 others were put in type, involving the reading of over 30,000 pages of proof; 4 volumes were printed and bound, and 4 were distributed; 54,027 copies of volumes were received from the Public Printer, and 46,974 books and parts or plates of the Atlas were sold or distributed—over 50,000 labels being prepared or verified for this purpose. During the same period an Index to Battles, Campaigns, etc., of 76 pages was prepared and printed.

By operation of law the War Records Office was merged into the Record and Pension Office July 1, 1899. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1900, 1 volume was put in type and 7 were indexed, involving the preparation of about 500 pages of index and the reading of over 4,500 pages of proof; 11 volumes were printed, bound, and distributed, completing the publication with the exception of the General Index; 133,949 books were received and 117,216 were sold or distributed, over 100,000 labels being prepared or verified for the purpose. The Additions and Corrections to the Rebellion Records was compiled and put in type, and work commenced upon the General Index to the entire publication.

War Records Office.

Annual pay roll, May 31, 1898.....	63 employees..	\$75,420.00
Annual pay roll, July 1, 1898.....	22 employees..	34,080.00
Reduction.....	41 employees..	41,340.00
Annual pay roll, June 30, 1899.....	21 employees..	29,080.00
Expenditures for printing and binding:		
1897-98.....		59,177.38
1898-99.....		62,495.00
1899-1900 (appropriation for public printing and binding, War Department), estimated.....		78,000.00

In connection with the expenditures for printing and binding, it may be noted that the increased expenditure for this item was caused by the steadily increasing output by the office of matter to be printed, and this increase in the output was accomplished by a steadily decreasing clerical force. The expenditure for printing and binding in 1897-98 was but 71 per cent of that for salaries, while in 1898-99 it was 2.08 times as large as that for salaries, and in 1899-1900 it was 2.66 times as large.

Besides the transaction of the current business of the office and the prosecution of the work of the publication of the Rebellion Records, such portion of the clerical force as has been available for the purpose has been employed in the work of reproducing, by the index record-card system, the records of individual military service. Promptly upon the receipt of the records of the disbanded Spanish-war organizations the work of the reproduction of those records was begun, and at the close of the last fiscal year about 40 per cent of them had been carried.

On the recommendation of the Chief of the Record and Pension Office a reduction of 22 was made in the clerical force of the office for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1900, representing a saving in salaries of \$35,340 per annum. This, added to the previous reduction of 300 in 1894, 50 in 1895, and 25 in 1897, makes a total reduction of force in the Record and Pension Office since its organization in 1892 of 407 clerks, representing an annual saving of over \$460,000 in salaries alone, besides the reduction of 42 employees of the War Records Office prior to its consolidation with the Record and Pension Office. Adding to the savings in salaries in the Record and Pension Office alone the savings effected in contingent and other expenses, it is found that the cost of maintaining the office has been permanently reduced by at least \$500,000 per annum.

RECRUITS.

(See Recruiting service.)

Statement showing the number of applicants for individual enlistment in United States Army, from April 21, 1898, to June 30, 1900.

[Does not include volunteers mustered in with organizations.]

	Number enlisted.	Number rejected.	Total number of applicants.
Regular Army.....	107,766	270,163	377,929
Volunteer regiments, Spanish war, recruited to full strength under General Orders, 61, of 1898.....	*41,849	12,892	54,241
Regiments United States Volunteers, under act March 2, 1899, and General Orders, 122, 150, 162, and 166, of 1899.....	35,784	52,315	88,099
Porto Rican Regiment (volunteers).....	914	2,890	3,804
Total.....	186,313	337,760	524,073

*The total number of enlisted men in these regiments, including those mustered in with organizations and those individually enlisted as above, was 213,218.

RECRUITING SERVICE.

Regulars.

Since the declaration of war with Spain the recruiting service for the Regular Army has been conducted practically on the same lines as before that time; that is, by details of officers of the Regular Army for general recruiting service at city recruiting stations. The number of city stations, however, has been increased from time to time as the necessities of the service demanded and the number of officers available would permit. All the recruiting officers have had instructions to enlist not only at their main stations, but at substations in surrounding cities and towns wherever there was a probability of obtaining recruits. Special regimental recruiting parties have also been sent out when practicable; but the withdrawal from the United States, for duty with expeditionary forces, of most of the regular infantry and cavalry regiments and the great need of artillery officers with their batteries have prevented the development of special regimental recruiting since the first two or three months of the war with Spain, making it necessary to depend mostly upon general recruiting stations for recruits. Enlistments at city stations have also been supplemented by enlistments at all military posts and in the field; 29,521 enlistments were made for the Regular Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and 62,142 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899. These figures do not include enlistments for the Hospital Corps.

Volunteers.

During the war with Spain enlistments for volunteer regiments in the field to fill them to the maximum were made by officers of such regiments detailed under the provisions of General Orders, No. 61, June 1, 1898, to recruit in the localities where their regiments were originally raised. Upward of 40,000 enlistments were thus made during the months of June, July, and August, 1898.

In recruiting the volunteer regiments authorized by the President under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1899, enlistments have been made by recruiting officers of the Regular Army at all city stations and at military posts, officers of the volunteer regiments as available being ordered to report at general recruiting stations to assist in recruiting for their regiments in their own immediate neighborhood.

From July 10 to September 20, 1899, 26,442 volunteers had been enlisted for the 25 regiments called for by the President, of whom 1,396 were enlisted in the Philippines.

REVENUES.

From customs at—		
Manila, August, 1898, to March 31, 1900.....		\$5,895,330.12
Iloilo, February, 1899, to March 31, 1900.....		517,565.27
Cebu, April, 1899, to March 31, 1900.....		344,386.11
All other ports, to March 31, 1900.....		13,693.43
Total receipts from customs from date of occupation.....		6,770,974.93

From internal revenue at—		
Manila, August, 1898, to March 31, 1900.....		553,455.41
Iloilo, February, 1899, to March 31, 1900.....		54,586.62
All other offices, to March 31, 1900.....		14,335.32
Total receipts from internal revenue from date of occupation.....		622,377.25

From all other sources at Manila, date of occupation to March 31, 1900 (including \$479,400.03 seized funds).....		824,065.90
From all other sources at all other points, date of occupation to March 31, 1900.....		28,093.03

Total receipts from miscellaneous sources from date of occupation.....		852,158.93
--	--	------------

Grand total receipts from all sources from date of occupation to March 31, 1900.....		8,245,511.11
--	--	--------------

The total revenues in the island of Porto Rico from date of American occupation to April 30, 1900, were \$2,728,390.83, made up as follows:

Customs revenues.....		\$2,152,914.04
Internal revenue.....	\$488,299.83	
Miscellaneous collections.....	5,906.33	
Fees and fines collected by clerks of courts.....	5,646.36	
Licenses to carry arms.....	2,443.96	
Fees for insurance privileges.....	1,500.50	
Miscellaneous fees from sundry sources.....	14,725.03	
Postal revenues.....	49,192.59	
Money-order fees.....	7,762.19	
		56,954.78
Total revenue.....		575,476.79

Receipts from internal revenue in Cuba from January 1, 1899, to May 31, 1900, \$1,158,096.49.	
Customs receipts in Cuba from January 1, 1899, to June 30, 1900, \$23,126,543.48.	

SAN JUAN.

San Juan, or San Juan Hill, which overlooks the city of Santiago de Cuba, has become famous as the scene of the severe conflict which took place between the armies of the United States and Spain in July, 1898. Both sides fought with desperate bravery, but the Spaniards suffered such severe losses that, after the American troops had entirely surrounded the Spanish position and were in readiness to advance upon the city, the Spanish forces, under General Toral, surrendered on July 17, 1898, the city and province of Santiago, together with all arms and ammunition. The signing of the peace protocol, shortly after the surrender had been made, put an end to hostilities between the two countries.

SANTIAGO DE CUBA.

This city was founded in 1514 and is the most southern place of any note in the island of Cuba, being in the twentieth degree of latitude. The surrounding country is very mountainous and the city is built upon a steep slope; the public square or Campo de Marte is 140 to 160 feet above the sea, and some of the houses are located 200 feet high. It is the second city in the island with regard to population, slightly exceeding that of Matanzas and Puerto Principe. The harbor is of the first class and one of the smallest of Cuban ports. From its entrance to its extreme northern limit it is 5 miles long, the city being located 4 miles from this entrance, on the northeastern side of the harbor. It was in this harbor that Cervantes' fleet took refuge, near where they were subsequently destroyed by the American Navy. The city surrendered to the American troops under Maj. Gen. William R. Shafter on July 17, 1898, after a determined resistance and prolonged negotiations, with arms, ammunition, and 22,789 Spanish soldiers.

Agreement for surrender was opened by Toral July 14, 1898; concluded July 16, and formal surrender of the city and province to American forces July 17, 1898.

SECRETARY OF WAR.

The Secretary of War is at the head of the War Department, and performs such duties as the President may enjoin upon him concerning the military service.

He has supervision of all the estimates of appropriations for the expenses of the Department, of all purchases of Army supplies, and of all expenditures for the support and transportation of the Army, and of such expenditures for a civil nature as are by law placed under his direction.

He also has supervision of the publication of the official records of the war of the rebellion, and of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification.

He has charge of all matters relating to river and harbor improvements, the prevention of obstruction to navigation, the establishment of harbor lines, and approves the plans and location of bridges authorized by Congress to be constructed over the navigable waters of the United States.

SIGNAL CORPS.

Total strength of Signal Corps, June 30, 1900: Officers, 46; enlisted men, 695; in addition to a large and fluctuating number of civilian employees—operators, repair men, etc.

Signal Corps, U. S. A., stationed as follows, August 20, 1900:

	Officers.	Enlisted men.
Alaska.....	3	55
Cuba.....	4	44
Philippine Islands.....	32	437
Porto Rico.....	1	44
United States.....	10	152
	50	732

The approach of war found the Signal Corps with 8 available officers and 50 enlisted men, with an equipment that was barely sufficient in time of peace.

The first call made on the Signal Corps was to place all military posts in the Department of the East in direct telegraphic communication with Department Headquarters, and to establish a system of intercommunication at all harbors where the defense consisted of separate batteries and forts.

All allotment was made from the National Defense Fund, and the following lines were constructed:

In New York Harbor Fort Hancock, N. J., was connected by a cable to Fort Wadsworth, N. Y., 12½ miles in length. The cable is a three-conductor, two conductors being utilized for telephonic and one for telegraphic intercommunication between these two posts. Between the terminal of the cable and Navesink light, New Jersey, 25 miles of overhead telephone wires for the purpose of intercommunication and range-finding systems were erected. From Fort Wadsworth a six-conductor cable was laid, 1½ miles long, to Fort Hamilton, N. Y., two of the conductors being for intercommunication between Forts Hancock, Wadsworth, and Hamilton, and the remaining four conductors for range-finding system.

The following briefly sets forth the electrical installation at fortifications on the Atlantic seaboard which the Signal Corps of the Army was compelled to install within a few weeks after the beginning of hostilities.

Fort Warren, Mass.—Cable to Long Island Head, Mass., 9,500 feet; from this point a short land line connects with the Boston municipal line, thence via Deer Island and Winthrop Head, connecting with the New England Telephone Company's wires.

Fort Greble, R. I.—A cable 3,000 feet long, three-conductor, connecting at Fox Hill with the lines of the Providence Telephone Company, giving service to Newport and thence to Fort Adams, R. I.

Block Island to Narragansett Pier, R. I.—Nineteen miles of two-conductor cable. **Fort Schuyler to Fort Totten, N. Y.**—One and one-fourth miles of six-conductor cable for intercommunication and range finding between these two posts.

Fort Delaware, Del.—Connected with Battery Point, Del., and Fort Mott, N. J., by a three-conductor cable, 3 miles in length. In addition, 7 miles of land line constructed from Fort Mott to Salem, N. J., giving the post direct telegraphic communication.

Fort Washington, Md., Sheridan Point, Va., line.—It being essential to connect the fortifications on the Potomac River below Washington City, 1 mile of three-conductor cable was laid between Fort Washington and Sheridan Point. From Sheridan Point a land line was constructed connecting the post with Fort Myer, Va., from whence there is a commercial line direct to the War Department. An alternate line was also constructed from Fort Washington, Md., to the naval Indian Head line, and on the poles of the Navy Department line to Anacostia, D. C.

Baltimore Harbor.—An overhead telephone line was constructed from Fort McHenry to North Point, about 3 miles, to connect with the lines of the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company in the Sparrow Point road; from Hawkins Point to Fort McHenry by an overhead wire to Shedd's Point; from Hawkins Point to Quarantine, some 2 miles, both poles and wire the property of the Signal Corps; from Quarantine to Shedd's Point, about 1½ miles—wire, belongs to the Signal Corps, which is strung on the poles of the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company; from Shedd's Point a three-pair cable crosses Curtis Creek to Floods Point, and from there to Fort McHenry, over the wire of the telephone company; at Hawkins Point a telephone system about 1½ miles long on the base line of the 8-inch B. L. R. battery at that point.

Fort Adams, R. I.—A single wire was stretched to connect with the commercial line at Newport, R. I.

Fort Cassell, N. C.—A land line connects the fortification with Southport, a distance of almost 2 miles.

Fort Monroe, Va.—At this post 850 yards of overhead line was constructed for the signal system and 600 yards of line for post intercommunication.

Fort Slocum, N. Y.—Connected to Neptune Dock, New Rochelle, N. Y., by 4,100 feet three-conductor cable, one conductor being used for telegraph and two for telephone service. A short land line then connects the cable with the Western Union wire.

Fort Trumbull, Conn.—About 14 miles of one-conductor cable was furnished by the Engineer Corps and laid by the Signal Corps from Goshen Point, Conn., to Gull Island; thence to Plum Island and across Plum Island by one-half mile of land line, connecting with the cable running to Gardiners Point. Connection is to be made at Goshen Point with the line of the commercial company, which work is not yet completed and will require 1,483 yards of twelve-conductor, twisted-pair, insulated wire, crossing river from New London to Groton Point, for use of range-finding system.

Fort Preble.—Connected with Portland by a telephone line, which line is intersected by the post line.

Governors Island, N. Y.—About three-fourths of a mile of fifteen-conductor cable was laid between this island and the barge office, in connection with the Treasury Department. Three of these conductors are for the use of the Signal Corps.

In the vicinity of San Francisco land lines were constructed from Point Bonita to Fort Baker and Sausalito; also from the Presidio wharf to Point Lobos. A cable for connecting the important forts of the harbor is yet to be provided.

Considerable work in connection with electrical intercommunication was also done at the various fortifications in the Department of the Gulf.

The following table shows the location and length of the United States military telegraph lines in the several military departments in the United States:

Sections and stations.	Length.
<i>Department of the Colorado.</i>	
Holbrook-Wilcox section:	Miles.
Holbrook, Ariz.....	0
Snowflake, Ariz.....	32
Cooley's Ranch, Ariz.....	68
Fort Apache, Ariz.....	92
San Carlos, Ariz.....	163
Geronimo, Ariz.....	190
Cedar Springs, Ariz.....	228
Fort Grant, Ariz.....	248
Wilcox, Ariz.....	274
Cedar Springs-Mammoth branch:	
Cedar Springs, Ariz.....	0
Hellner's Ranch, Ariz.....	13
Mammoth, Ariz.....	42
Bisbee-San Bernardino branch:	
Bisbee, Ariz.....	0
United States custom-house station.....	9
San Bernardino, Ariz.....	42
Fort Du Chesne-Price section:	
Fort Du Chesne, Utah.....	0
Du Chesne Bridge, Utah.....	12
The Wells, Utah.....	26
Lee's Ranch, Utah.....	50
Price, Utah.....	87
Fort Bayard-Silver City line:	
Silver City, N. Mex.....	0
Fort Bayard, N. Mex.....	8
Halls Station, N. Mex.....	13
Fort Huachuca line:	
Fort Huachuca, Ariz.....	0
Huachuca Sliding, Ariz.....	7
Fort Washakie-Lander line:	
Lander, Wyo.....	0
Fort Washakie, Wyo.....	16
Fort Wingate line:	
Fort Wingate, N. Mex.....	0
Wingate railroad station.....	3
<i>Department of Dakota.</i>	
Fort Yates-Bismarck section:	
Bismarck, N. Dak.....	0
Cannon Ball, N. Dak.....	41
Fort Yates, N. Dak.....	65
<i>Department of the Missouri.</i>	
Fort Reno-El Reno line:	
Fort Reno, Okla.....	0
El Reno, Okla.....	5
Fort Sill-Rush Springs line:	
Fort Sill, Okla.....	0
Rush Springs, Okla.....	28
Fort Niobrara-Valentine line:	
Valentine, Nebr.....	0
Fort Niobrara, Nebr.....	5
<i>Department of the Gulf.</i>	
Fort Brown-McIntosh line:	
Fort Brown, Tex.....	0
Santa Maria, Tex.....	24
Edinburg, Tex.....	51
Fort Ringgold, Tex.....	100
Roma, Tex.....
Carizzo, Tex.....
Fort McIntosh, Tex. (Laredo).....	200
Fort Bliss-El Paso line:	
El Paso, Tex.....	0
Fort Bliss, Tex.....	6
Fort Clark-Spofford Junction line:	
Fort Clark, Tex.....	0
Spofford Junction.....	10

For the purpose of maintaining communication between Key West and base of operations in Cuba a ship of about 1,000 tons was chartered in New York and equipped as a cable ship.

From the very inception of the enterprise the want of means for its execution was apparent. There was no cable ship under the American flag, and efforts to procure a suitable foreign ship were unavailing. The stock of available deep-sea cable in the United States was limited to small amounts held by different companies for repairs, and the cable factories were all working to their full capacity on orders already given by the War Department. The Western Union Telegraph Company had at Key West a set of machinery suitable for the work, which was placed at the disposal of the Department. A ship was immediately chartered with a view of sending her to Key West and completing her equipment there, but on returning to the Western Union office after an absence of an hour it was found that the Secretary of the Navy desired the immediate use of this machinery, and as he had a ship at Key West on which the installation could be made at once, all claims of the War Department were instantly released.

The Department, through the Western Union Company, was put in communication with President Scrymser, of the Mexican Telegraph Company, who placed at the disposal of the Department all the machinery, etc., of that company, which was installed on the *Adria* under the direction of Mr. Robertson, of the Mexican Company. The ship was sent to Boston and there took 24 miles of deep-sea cable, furnished by the Western Union Company, then returned to New York, took on 29 miles of intermediate-type cable and 60 miles insulated, but unarmed, wire, also telephones, telegraph instruments, and supplies for land lines, and proceeded to Key West.

The ship left Key West on May 28, 1898, and arrived at Santiago June 1, 1898, and immediately proceeded with the work of destroying communication with Cuba. Two cables were destroyed, one of them in over 1,000 fathoms of water.

This ship then repaired the cable between Guantanamo and Mole St. Nicholas, and between Guantanamo and Siboney. Material was landed from the ship, with which a line was built to the headquarters of the army in front of Santiago, and from these headquarters to the various commanding officers along the line.

A cable was also laid from Guantanamo to Daiquiri, a distance of 46 miles, the first war cable ever established during the active prosecution of hostilities.

STRENGTH OF THE ARMY.

The strength of the Regular Army on the 1st of April, 1898, just before the breaking out of the war, was as follows:

	Officers.	Enlisted men.
General officers and staff corps.....	532	2,025
Cavalry.....	437	6,047
Artillery.....	288	4,486
Infantry.....	886	12,828
Miscellaneous.....		653
Total.....	2,143	25,040

The Regular Army was authorized to be increased to 65,000 men as a war footing.

Strength of the armies of the United States.

Date.	Regulars.	Volunteers.	Total.
April 15, 1898.....	28,183		28,183
May 31, 1898.....	38,816	124,776	162,592
August 31, 1898.....	66,362	216,256	272,618
January 31, 1899.....	65,531	90,241	155,772
June 30, 1899.....	63,535	16,550	80,085

Maximum force at any one time during Spanish-American war, 274,717 officers and men.

On the 29th of November, 1898, the Army of the United States consisted of 2,324 officers and 61,444 enlisted men of the regular force, and of 5,216 officers and 110,202 enlisted men of the volunteer force, making an aggregate of 7,540 officers and 171,646 enlisted men.

The military forces in the service of the United States in 1899 were composed follows:

Regular Army.

	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Total.
General officers.....	7		7
Adjutant-General's Department.....	14		14
Inspector-General's Department.....	8		8
Judge-Advocate-General's Department.....	7		7
Quartermaster's Department.....	39	105	144
Subsistence Department.....	19	163	182
Medical Department.....	167	3,314	3,481
Pay Department.....	26		26
Corps of Engineers.....	123	628	751
Ordnance Department.....	62	681	743
Signal Corps.....	5	550	555
Chaplains.....	30		30
Record and Pension Office.....	2		2
Military Academy.....		246	246
Electrician sergeants.....		15	15
Total.....	509	5,702	6,211
10 regiments of cavalry.....		12,022	12,022
7 regiments of artillery.....		10,191	10,191
25 regiments of infantry.....		34,583	34,583
Indian scouts and recruits.....		1,579	1,579
Total.....			64,586

U. S. VOLUNTEERS.

General officers and staff corps.....	260
1 regiment of cavalry.....	1,284
24 regiments of infantry.....	32,616
Porto Rico battalion.....	414
Total.....	34,574

RECAPITULATION.

Regular Army.....	64,586
U. S. Volunteers.....	34,574
Grand total.....	99,160

In 1899 the Regular Army was distributed as follows:

	Officers.	Enlisted men.
In Cuba.....	334	10,796
In Porto Rico.....	87	2,885
On the continent of North America.....	910	17,317
In Hawaii.....	12	453
In the Philippine Islands.....	905	30,578
Total.....	2,248	61,999

American forces in the Philippines, August 15, 1899, approximately, 31,000.

The approximate strength of the Army of the United States on June 30, 1900, consisted of:

	Officers.	Enlisted men.
Regulars.....	2,550	65,000
Volunteers.....	1,250	31,000

SUBSISTENCE DEPARTMENT.

Number of claims on hand received and disposed of during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899:

	Claims for commutation of rations.		Total.
	While held as prisoner of war in rebel States.	While on furlough and miscellaneous claims.	
There were on hand June 30, 1898.....	32	357	389
Received during the fiscal year.....	320	5,320	5,640
Total.....	352	5,677	6,029
Disposed of during the year.....	284	4,020	4,304
On hand June 30, 1899.....	68	1,657	1,725

The number of letters, indorsements, and postal cards written during the year in connection with the above claims was 7,091.

Depots of supplies.

Subsistence stores in vast quantities were accumulated at various points during the period of the war with Spain. The principal places at which these accumulations took place were Tampa, Savannah, Huntsville, Chickamauga Park, Atlanta, and Camp Meade. As soon as practicable after the removal of troops from the vicinity of these places such of the stores as were in fit condition were distributed to other points where needed, and such as had undergone deterioration were disposed of by condemnation and sale. The leaving of these accumulations on hand was in large part due to the sudden termination of the war, and the consequent early dissolution of the Volunteer Army.

Issues to Spanish prisoners of war were made to the value of \$206,398.06.

Special issues have been made up to June 30, 1899, as follows:

Persons, etc., to whom issued.	Value.	Refunded.
United States marines en route from San Francisco to Manila.....	\$1,574.34	\$1,574.34
United States marines at San Juan, Porto Rico.....	1,319.61	1,137.27
Sufferers by overflow of Chattahoochee River.....	13,780.04	
Tidal-wave sufferers in Georgia.....	3,577.14	
Texas flood sufferers.....	430.96	
Porto Rican forces.....	537.83	
Destitute Porto Ricans.....	6,319.74	324.71
Cuban destitutes.....	1,417,554.07	52,285.15
Cuban army.....	26,654.08	
Cuban guards.....	485.15	
Cuban rural police.....	7,988.31	7,988.31
Insane asylum at Ferso, Cuba.....	681.42	681.42
Post-office clerks at Ponce and Utuado, Porto Rico.....	65.59	
Red Cross hospital at Ponce, Porto Rico.....	94.05	
Filipino insurgent prisoners of war at various stations in Manila.....	32,181.05	
Destitute Filipinos.....	1,161.71	
Destitute Macabebes.....	1,141.90	

Clerical work, office Commissary-General of Subsistence.

Statement of accounts current and returns on hand June 30, 1898, received and examined during fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, and on hand at close of same awaiting examination:

	Accounts current.	Returns of stores.	Returns of property.	Total.
On hand June 30, 1898.....	29	52	1	82
Received during fiscal year 1899.....	7,111	4,439	1,738	13,318
Total.....	7,140	4,491	1,739	13,470
Examined during the year.....	6,802	3,326	1,502	11,730
On hand June 30, 1899.....	338	1,165	237	1,740

The examination of the accounts current required the verification of 158,242 vouchers; the returns of subsistence stores, 40,923, and the returns of subsistence property, 4,828 vouchers.

In connection with the examinations 5,947 postal cards were used, and 8,150 letters and 6,188 indorsements were written and recorded.

Contracts for supplies, etc., to the number of 386 were received and acted on. Certificates of services as acting commissary of subsistence were issued to the number of 607, and of nonindebtedness to the number of 6,156.

SURGEON-GENERAL.

The Surgeon-General, under the immediate direction of the Secretary of War, is charged with the administrative duties of the Medical Department, the designation of the stations of medical officers, and the issuing of all orders and instructions relating to their professional duties. He directs as to the selection, purchase, and distribution of the medical supplies of the Army. The Army Medical Museum and the official publications of the Surgeon-General's Office are also under his direct control.

TRANSPORTATION OF SPANISH PRISONERS OF WAR TO SPAIN.

The following is a statement showing the dates of embarkation, names of vessels, and number of officers, enlisted men, and others who took passage:

Date of embarkation.	Name of vessel.	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Women and children over 5 years of age.	Priests and Sisters of Charity.	Total.
Aug. 9	Alicante	38	1,069	6	11	1,124
Aug. 14	Isla de Luzon	137	2,056	40	4	2,237
Aug. 16	Covadonga	109	2,148	79		2,336
Aug. 19	Villaverde	52	565	34		651
Aug. 19	Isla de Panay	99	1,599	26	5	1,729
Aug. 22	P. de Satrustegui	128	2,359	68		2,555
Aug. 25	Montevideo	136	2,108	122	2	2,368
Aug. 27	Cheribon	18	905	37		960
Aug. 28	Colón	100	1,316	59		1,475
Aug. 30	do	23	726	5		754
Sept. 1	Leon XIII	113	2,209	108		2,430
Sept. 3	San Ignacio	59	1,408	20	12	1,499
Sept. 6	Leonora	15	1,118			1,333
Sept. 12	Ciudad de Cadiz	53		19	14	86
Sept. 17	San Augustin	65	800	45		910
Sept. 17	San Francisco	18	588	11		617
	Total	1,163	20,974	679	48	22,864

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

The records of the Quartermaster's Department show that troops and civilian employees were transported by sea between April 1 and September 15, 1898, as follows:

	Men.
To Cuba	28,195
To Porto Rico	17,460
To Manila	16,405
To Honolulu	629
Returned from Cuba	21,686
Returned from Porto Rico	5,541
Civilian employees transported	2,920
Total	92,836

TRANSPORTATION OF THE ARMY.

Transport service, Army.—Transports, freighters, and stock boats chartered, 104; tugs and lighters, 18; transports purchased, 18; hospital ships, 2; tugs and lighters, 12.

American troops transported by, from declaration of the war with Spain to August 15, 1899: To Cuba, 65,800; to Manila, 39,350; to Porto Rico, 23,299; to Hawaii, 1,408. From Cuba, 54,377; from Manila, 12,000; from Porto Rico, 20,784; from Hawaii, 920. Total movement, 217,938.

Vessels in, plying between United States, Cuba, Porto Rico, and Philippine Islands, for troops, 36; animals, 12.

Repatriation of American troops from the Philippines to August 15, 1899: Regulars, 5 officers, 95 men; volunteers, 309 officers, 6,671 men.

American, returned from Philippines to August 15, 1899: Regulars, 1 officer, 98 men; volunteers, 309 officers, 6,671 men.

Wagons, mules, and horses purchased since declaration of war, April 25, 1898, to August 15, 1899: Wagons, 6,462; mules, 20,521; horses, 19,170.

Rail.—Number of American troops transported by rail from declaration of war to August 15, 1899, 716,890 officers and men.

This transportation has involved the use of nearly every railroad in the United States, as well as the transportation of every organization connected with the Army, and some of these organizations have been transported several times, thus accounting for the large aggregate of officers and men.

Competition, after public advertisement, has governed all of the movements of troops, and the lowest rates by desirable routes have always been accepted. This has conduced the cost to not exceeding one-half the rates charged the general public by these railroads in published tariffs, and all the movements have been effected with a phenomenal absence of accidents or any perplexing delay, so that the troops have been placed from point to point where required, with a rapidity and safety which has been alike creditable to the railway companies and to the officers of the Quartermaster's Department who were charged with making the necessary arrangements.

On all journeys requiring more than one night's travel the men as well as the officers have been provided with sleeping-car accommodations, or else a full double seat in coach for each man.

A hospital train, consisting of Pullman equipments and all necessary outfit for proper care and nourishment en route, was kept in constant service during the war to move the sick from camps to the large improved hospitals situated in different parts of the country, and no expense or care was omitted to furnish them with every convenience and comfort on their journeys.

In addition to the 716,890 officers and men transported by the Quartermaster's Department up to August 15, 1899, there have been reported to June 30, 1900, 33,494, making a total number of 750,384 to that date.

Number of officers, enlisted men, and civilians transported on army transports between August 15, 1899, and June 30, 1900.

From the United States to the Philippines:	
Officers	1,542
Enlisted men	37,602
Civilians	1,346
	40,490
From the Philippines to the United States:	
Officers	518
Enlisted men	10,200
Civilians	143
	10,861
From the United States to Honolulu:	
Officers	5
Enlisted men	44
Civilians	76
	125
From New York to Cuba:	
Officers	137
Enlisted men	2,230
Civilians	602
	2,969

Number of officers, enlisted men, and civilians, etc.—Continued.

From Cuba to New York:	
Officers	89
Enlisted men	2,104
Civilians	3,383
Remains	310
	5,886
From New York to Porto Rico:	
Officers	60
Enlisted men	617
Civilians	376
	1,053
From Porto Rico to New York:	
Officers	15
Enlisted men	375
Civilians	198
	588
Total	61,972

Between August 15, 1899, and June 30, 1900, there were 23 vessels chartered, 18 of which were discharged before June 30, 1900.

Between same dates there were 6 vessels purchased.

Statement of Spanish prisoners sent from Manila to Spain from November 7, 1898, to June 5, 1900.

Officers	1,579
Soldiers	13,425
Women and major children	1,346
Minor children	436
Officials	57
Civil employees	333
Civil lady pensionists	2
Civil lady pensionists, major child	1
Civil lady pensionists, minor child	1
Telegraph operators, minor child	1
Civil prisoners	4
Civil prisoners, wives and major children	11
Civil prisoners, minor children	3
Monks	51
Nuns	2
Private citizens (prisoners)	14
Priests	9
Total	17,315

Total number of animals, wagons, harness, etc., purchased during the period from April 1, 1898, to August 31, 1898, inclusive.

Cavalry horses	10,743
Artillery horses	2,551
Pack horses	40
Draft horses	1,137
Riding horses	2,115
Bell mares	32
Draft mules	17,515
Pack mules	2,667
Harness, S. S.	28,012
Army wagons	904
Escort wagons	109
Farm wagons	3,005
Spring wagons	79
Wagonettes	8
Miscellaneous wagons	224
Ambulances:	
Rucker	500
Red Cross	59

Total number of animals, wagons, harness, etc., purchased during the period from September 1, 1898, to June 30, 1900.

Cavalry horses	3,674
Artillery horses	106
Pack horses	71
Draft horses	21
Riding horses	2,566
Bell mares	3
Draft mules	38
Pack mules	401
Harness, S. S.	4,895
Army wagons and escort wagons	760
Farm wagons	617
Spring wagons	200
Wagonettes	38
Miscellaneous wagons	248
Ambulances:	
Rucker	1
Red Cross	140

On the 20th of November, 1898, we had 8 vessels owned by the United States engaged in the transportation of troops and freight between the United States and the Philippines, 25 vessels chartered and fitted up by us engaged in the same service, and 18 vessels chartered and fitted up by us engaged in the transportation of animals, forage, and freight, making a total transport fleet in the Philippine service of 51 steam vessels.

The report of the Quartermaster-General shows that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, that branch of the service transported between Cuba, Porto Rico, Honolulu, the Philippines, and the United States, 202,587 passengers, 27,353 animals, and 86,150 tons of freight, and that transportation was furnished during the same period, by rail and water, exclusive of the army transport service, for 1,664,383 persons, 72,711 animals, and 544,644 tons of material. The efficiency and safety of this service and the freedom from disease and accident which have characterized it are very gratifying.

The transport service on the Atlantic is conducted entirely by vessels owned by the Government, which now make regular trips between New York, Habana, Santiago, and Porto Rico. They carried during the six months from January 1 to June 30, 1899, 45,507 passengers, 29,133 tons of freight, 2,449 parcels and pieces of baggage, and 6,558 animals. The total cost of that service for this period was \$1,697,744.49, including the cost of rations, amounting to \$90,500.

The following is a list of the army transports purchased during the last fiscal year, showing their new names, class, cost, and where they are now employed:

Old name of vessel.	New name.	Tonnage.	Class.	Cost.	Where employed.
Mohawk	Grant	5,658	Troop ship	\$660,000	In Pacific fleet.
Mobile	Sherman	5,780	do	660,000	Do.
Massachusetts	Sheridan	5,738	do	660,000	Do.
Arizona	Hancock	5,000	do	600,000	Do.
Scandia	Warren	4,243	do	200,000	Do.
Panama	Hooker	2,085	Cable ship	41,000	Do.
Manitoba	Logan	5,763	Troop ship	660,000	Being fitted for Pacific fleet.
Minnewaska	Thomas	5,796	do	660,000	Do.
Berlin	Meade	5,641	do	400,000	Do.
Port Victor	McClellan	2,792	Troop and freight ship	175,000	Atlantic fleet.
Rita	Burnside	2,194	do	125,000	Do.
Mississippi	Buford	3,732	do	350,000	Do.
Michigan	Kilpatrick	3,722	do	350,000	Do.
Roumanian	Crook	4,126	do	240,000	Do.
Obdam	McPherson	3,656	do	250,000	Do.
Chester	Sedgwick	4,770	do	200,000	Do.
Clearwater	Ingalls	1,147	do	150,000	Do.
Bay State	Wright	777	do	100,000	Do.
Hartford	Terry	1,338	Hospital ship	150,000	Do.
Missouri	Missouri	1,857	do	200,000	Pacific fleet.
Eugene Russell	Poe	1,157	Steam lighter	39,500	Atlantic fleet.
Adonis	Williams	198	do	26,000	Do.
Ed. Ward	Baker	200	do	25,000	Do.
Iron King	Canby	209	do	36,000	Transferred to depot quarter-master, New York City.
Britannia	Reno		Tug	40,000	Atlantic fleet.
Gypsum King	Slocum		do	150,000	Do.
Sarah	Ord		do	6,300	Do.
Major McKinley	Sumner		do	13,000	Do.
Olympic	Weitzel		do	12,000	Do.
Harry	Richardson		do	6,000	Do.
J. C. Watson	Reynolds		do	14,000	Do.
E. L. Bartley			Barge	5,000	Do.
Willie			do	5,000	Do.
Mocha			do	10,000	Do.
Annie			do	10,000	Do.
Helen			do	10,000	Do.
L. E. Reinhardt			do	5,500	Do.
Esperanza		9.50	Sloop	850	Do.
Miguel		21.88	do	550	Do.
Total				7,245,700	

Name of transport.	Purchase price.	Amount paid for refitting and repair.	Total expenditure.
ON PACIFIC OCEAN.			
Grant	\$660,000.00	\$350,658.69	\$1,010,658.69
Hancock	600,000.00	547,016.28	1,147,016.28
Logan	660,000.00	558,839.33	1,218,839.33
Meade	400,000.00	508,733.14	908,733.14
Sheridan	660,000.00	624,644.38	1,284,644.38
Sherman	660,000.00	572,847.58	1,232,847.58
Sumner	160,594.00	652,218.89	812,812.89
Thomas	660,000.00	455,336.37	1,115,336.37
Warren	200,000.00	192,328.61	392,328.61
ON ATLANTIC OCEAN.			
Buford	350,000.00	480,345.56	830,345.56
Burnside	125,000.00	183,466.29	308,466.29
Crook	240,000.00	238,317.59	478,317.59
Kilpatrick	350,000.00	538,039.30	888,039.30
McClellan	175,000.00	314,418.53	489,418.53
McPherson	250,000.00	155,562.77	405,562.77
Sedgwick	200,000.00	278,424.62	478,424.62
Total	6,350,594.00	6,646,197.93	12,996,791.93
Deduct saving to Government as per last foregoing statement			9,087,155.32
Leaves actual net cost of 16 transports			3,909,636.61

Total number of passengers transported during the fiscal year to Manila from San Francisco	30,643
From New York	5,582
Total	36,225

Since the close of the last fiscal year 701 officers, 20,905 enlisted men, and 194 civilians have been transported to Manila from San Francisco.

	Passengers.
From the United States to Cuba	54,136
From Cuba to the United States	58,113
From the United States to Porto Rico	25,459
From Porto Rico to the United States	22,903
From the United States to the Philippines	36,225
From the Philippines to the United States	2,400
From the United States to Honolulu	1,901
From Honolulu to the United States	1,450
Total	202,587

From May 25, 1898, to October 10, 1899, a total of 270,154 passengers have been

transported to Cuba, Porto Rico, Honolulu, and the Philippines, and returned to the United States from those places by the army transports of this Department.

The reports received show that during the year there were shipped—

From the United States to—	Animals.
Cuba	17,141
Porto Rico	5,722
Manila	865
From Cuba to the United States	1,772
From Porto Rico to the United States	1,853
Total	27,353

The shipments of freight, as shown by the reports received, have been on the—	Tons.
Atlantic	49,074
Pacific	37,076
Total	86,150

In addition there have been transported large quantities of miscellaneous packages and baggage not included in the above.

The sum of \$5,355,470.23 was paid during the past fiscal year for charter of all classes of vessels employed in the transport service; the sum of \$7,445,700 for the purchase of all classes of vessels, and the sum of \$2,654,696.92 for fitting up army transport ships and for supplies purchased for their maintenance at the two principal ports of the transport service, including pay of employees connected therewith.

The total amount of coal purchased during the fiscal year for use of transport vessels, as far as reported, is 121,200 tons.

VOLUNTEER ENGINEERS.

By the act approved May 11, 1898, Congress authorized the organization of a volunteer brigade of engineers from the nation at large, to consist of not more than three regiments and not more than 3,500 men possessing the special qualifications for engineer troops, the officers of the brigade to be appointed by the Secretary of War.

The same act authorized the organization of an additional volunteer force not exceeding 10,000 men possessing immunity from disease incident to tropical climates, the officers of the regiment being appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate. Ten regiments were organized under this act, designated "United States Volunteer Infantry, numbered from 1 to 10, inclusive." Four of these regiments, namely, 7, 8, 9, and 10, were composed of colored enlisted men and colored commissioned officers below the grade of captain. All of these regiments were raised in the Southern States.

Under section 7 of the act approved April 22, 1898, three regiments of volunteer cavalry were raised among the "cowboys" of the Western frontier, and known as the First, Second, and Third United States Volunteer Cavalry.

Under the provisions of the act approved March 2, 1899, "to meet the present exigencies of the military service the President is hereby authorized to maintain the Regular Army at a strength of not exceeding 65,000 enlisted men," etc., "and raise a force of not more than 35,000 volunteers, to be recruited as he may determine from the country at large * * * and to organize the same into not more than 27 regiments organized as are infantry regiments of war strength in the Regular Army, and 3 regiments to be composed of men of special qualifications in horsemanship and marksmanship to be organized as cavalry for service, mounted or dismounted," and "such increased regular and volunteer force shall continue in service only during the necessity therefor, and not later than July 1, 1901."

Within the President's discretion on July 5, 1899, he authorized the enlistment of 10 regiments of infantry, known as U. S. Volunteer Infantry, and numbered from 26 to 35 consecutively, and General Otis was authorized to raise 3 regiments from among those soldiers in the Philippines who desired to reenlist, and these regiments are known as 11th U. S. Volunteer Cavalry, 36th and 37th U. S. Volunteer Infantry, and subsequently on August 17 10 additional regiments of infantry was authorized to be raised, and are numbered from 38 to 47 consecutively, and 2 regiments of colored troops are being recruited and are known as the 48th and 49th U. S. Volunteer Infantry. In these regiments the full quota of men authorized by the above-mentioned act are to be enlisted, and together with the Regular Army, already at its maximum, the present strength of the two branches of the services is approximately 100,000 men.

VESELS.

Spanish vessels destroyed by United States Navy, 17; captured, 9; prizes captured, 113.

Destruction of Spanish fleet, consisting of *Maria Teresa*, *Oquendo*, *Cristobal Colon*, *Furor*, and *Pluton*, under Admiral Cervera, by American Navy, under Admirals Sampson and Schley, which included the *Brooklyn*, *Oregon*, *Iowa*, *Texas*, and *Gloucester*, July 3, 1898. American loss, 1 killed, 2 wounded. Cervera and Spanish officers taken prisoners.

WAR DEPARTMENT.

The law provides that there shall be at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the Department of War, and a Secretary of War, who shall be the head thereof. The Department of War and the office of the Secretary of War were created by the act of August 7, 1789. The Secretary of War succeeded to the office and functions of the Secretary at War, whose powers and duties were defined in an ordinance of Congress dated January 27, 1785. The office of the Secretary of War included that of Secretary of the Navy until April 30, 1798, when the Department of the Navy was established.

APPENDIX 1.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, COMMUNICATED TO THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS, ON THE RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES TO SPAIN BY REASON OF WARFARE IN THE ISLAND OF CUBA

To the Congress of the United States:

Obedient to that precept of the Constitution which commands the President to give from time to time to the Congress information of the state of the Union and to recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient, it becomes my duty now to address your body with regard to the grave crisis that has arisen in the relations of the United States to Spain by reason of the warfare that for more than three years has raged in the neighboring island of Cuba.

I do so because of the intimate connection of the Cuban question with the state of our own Union and the grave relation the course which it is now incumbent upon the nation to adopt must needs bear to the traditional policy of our Government if it is to accord with the precepts laid down by the founders of the Republic and religiously observed by succeeding Administrations to the present day.

The present revolution is but the successor of other similar insurrections which have occurred in Cuba against the dominion of Spain, extending over a period of nearly half a century, each of which, during its progress, has subjected the United States to great effort and expense in enforcing its neutrality laws, caused enormous losses to American trade and commerce, caused irritation, annoyance,

and disturbance among our citizens, and, by the exercise of cruel, barbarous, and uncivilized practices of warfare, shocked the sensibilities and offended the humane sympathies of our people.

Since the present revolution began, in February, 1895, this country has seen the fertile domain at our threshold ravaged by fire and sword in the course of a struggle unequalled in the history of the island and rarely paralleled as to the numbers of the combatants and the bitterness of the contest by any revolution of modern times where a dependent people striving to be free have been opposed by the power of the sovereign state.

Our people have beheld a once prosperous community reduced to comparative want, its lucrative commerce virtually paralyzed, its exceptional productiveness diminished, its fields laid waste, its mills in ruins, and its people perishing by tens of thousands from hunger and destitution. We have found ourselves constrained, in the observance of that strict neutrality which our laws enjoin and which the law of nations commands, to police our own waters and watch our own seaports in prevention of any unlawful act in aid of the Cubans.

Our trade has suffered; the capital invested by our citizens in Cuba has been largely lost, and the temper and forbearance of our people have been so sorely tried as to beget a perilous unrest among our own citizens which has inevitably found its expression from time to time in the National Legislature, so that issues wholly external to our own body politic engross attention and stand in the way of that close devotion to domestic advancement that becomes a self-contained commonwealth whose primal maxim has been the avoidance of all foreign entanglements. All this must needs awaken, and has, indeed, aroused the utmost concern on the part of this Government, as well during my predecessor's term as in my own.

In April, 1896, the evils from which our country suffered through the Cuban war became so onerous that my predecessor made an effort to bring about a peace through the mediation of this Government in any way that might tend to an honorable adjustment of the contest between Spain and her revolted colony, on the basis of some effective scheme of self-government for Cuba under the flag and sovereignty of Spain. It failed through the refusal of the Spanish Government then in power to consider any form of mediation or, indeed, any plan of settlement which did not begin with the actual submission of the insurgents to the mother country, and then only on such terms as Spain herself might see fit to grant. The war continued unabated. The resistance of the insurgents was in no wise diminished.

The efforts of Spain were increased, both by the dispatch of fresh levies to Cuba and by the addition to the horrors of the strife of a new and inhuman phase happily unprecedented in the modern history of civilized Christian peoples. The policy of devastation and concentration, inaugurated by the captain-general's bando of October 21, 1896, in the province of Pinar del Rio, was thence extended to embrace all of the island to which the power of the Spanish arms was able to reach by occupation or by military operations. The peasantry, including all dwelling in the open agricultural interior, were driven into the garrison towns or isolated places held by the troops.

The raising and movement of provisions of all kinds were interdicted. The fields were laid waste, dwellings unroofed and fired, mills destroyed, and, in short, everything that could desolate the land and render it unfit for human habitation or support was commanded by one or the other of the contending parties and executed by all the powers at their disposal.

By the time the present Administration took office, a year ago, reconcentration—so called—had been made effective over the better part of the four central and western provinces—Santa Clara, Matanzas, Habana, and Pinar del Rio.

The agricultural population to the estimated number of 300,000 or more was herded within the towns and their immediate vicinity, deprived of the means of support, rendered destitute of shelter, left poorly clad, and exposed to the most unsanitary conditions. As the scarcity of food increased with the devastation of the depopulated areas of production, destitution and want became misery and starvation. Month by month the death rate increased in an alarming ratio. By March, 1897, according to conservative estimates from official Spanish sources, the mortality among the reconcentrados, from starvation and the diseases thereto incident, exceeded 50 per centum of their total number.

No practical relief was accorded to the destitute. The overburdened towns, already suffering from the general dearth, could give no aid. So-called "zones of cultivation" established within the immediate areas of effective military control about the cities and fortified camps proved illusory as a remedy for the suffering. The unfortunate, being for the most part women and children, with aged and helpless men, enfeebled by disease and hunger, could not have tilled the soil without tools, seed, or shelter for their own support or for the supply of the cities. Reconcentration, adopted avowedly as a war measure in order to cut off the resources of the insurgents, worked its predestined result. As I said in my message of last December, it was not civilized warfare; it was extermination. The only peace it could beget was that of the wilderness and the grave.

Meanwhile the military situation in the island had undergone a noticeable change. The extraordinary activity that characterized the second year of the war, when the insurgents invaded even the hitherto unharmed fields of Pinar del Rio and carried havoc and destruction up to the walls of the city of Habana itself, had relapsed into a dogged struggle in the central and eastern provinces. The Spanish arms regained a measure of control in Pinar del Rio and parts of Havana, but, under the existing conditions of the rural country, without immediate improvement of their productive situation. Even thus partially restricted, the revolutionists held their own, and their conquest and submission, put forward by Spain as the essential and sole basis of peace, seemed as far distant as at the outset.

In this state of affairs my Administration found itself confronted with the grave problem of its duty. My message of last December reviewed the situation, and narrated the steps taken with a view to relieving its acuteness and opening the way to some form of honorable settlement. The assassination of the prime minister, Canovas, led to a change of government in Spain. The former administration, pledged to subjugation without concession, gave place to that of a more liberal party, committed long in advance to a policy of reform involving the wider principle of home rule for Cuba and Porto Rico.

The overtures of this Government, made through its new envoy, General Woodford, and looking to an immediate and effective amelioration of the condition of the island, although not accepted to the extent of admitted mediation in any shape, were met by assurances that home rule, in an advanced phase, would be forthwith offered to Cuba, without waiting for the war to end, and that more humane methods should thenceforth prevail in the conduct of hostilities. Coincidentally with these declarations, the new Government of Spain continued and completed the policy already begun by its predecessor, of testifying friendly regard for this nation by releasing American citizens held under one charge or another connected with the insurrection, so that by the end of November not a single person entitled in any way to our national protection remained in a Spanish prison.

While these negotiations were in progress the increasing destitution of the unfortunate reconcentrados and the alarming mortality among them claimed earnest attention. The success which had attended the limited measure of relief extended to the suffering American citizens among them by the judicious expenditure through the consular agencies of the money appropriated expressly for their succor by the joint resolution approved May 24, 1897, prompted the humane extension of a similar scheme of aid to the great body of sufferers. A suggestion to this end was acquiesced in by the Spanish authorities. On the 24th of December last I caused to be issued an appeal to the American people, inviting

contributions in money or in kind for the succor of the starving sufferers in Cuba, following this on the 8th of January by a similar public announcement of the formation of a central Cuban relief committee, with headquarters in New York City, composed of three members, representing the American National Red Cross and the religious and business elements of the community.

The efforts of that committee have been untiring and have accomplished much. Arrangements for free transportation to Cuba have greatly aided the charitable work. The president of the American Red Cross and representatives of other contributory organizations have generously visited Cuba and cooperated with the consul-general and the local authorities to make effective distribution of the relief collected through the efforts of the central committee. Nearly \$200,000 in money and supplies has already reached the sufferers, and more is forthcoming. The supplies are admitted duty free, and transportation to the interior has been arranged, so that the relief, at first necessarily confined to Habana and the larger cities, is now extended through most, if not all, of the towns where suffering exists.

Thousands of lives have already been saved. The necessity for a change in the condition of the reconcentrados is recognized by the Spanish Government. Within a few days past the orders of General Weyler have been revoked; the reconcentrados, it is said, are to be permitted to return to their homes, and aided to resume the self-supporting pursuits of peace. Public works have been ordered to give them employment, and a sum of \$600,000 has been appropriated for their relief.

The war in Cuba is of such a nature that short of subjugation or extermination a final military victory for either side seems impracticable. The alternative lies in the physical exhaustion of the one or the other party, or perhaps of both—a condition which in effect ended the ten years' war by the truce of Zanjón. The prospect of such a protraction and conclusion of the present strife is a contingency hardly to be contemplated with equanimity by the civilized world, and least of all by the United States, affected and injured as we are, deeply and intimately, by its very existence.

Realizing this, it appeared to be my duty, in a spirit of true friendliness, no less to Spain than to the Cubans, who have so much to lose by the prolongation of the struggle, to seek to bring about an immediate termination of the war. To this end I submitted, on the 27th ultimo, as a result of much representation and correspondence, through the United States minister at Madrid, propositions to the Spanish Government looking to an armistice until October 1 for the negotiation of peace with the good offices of the President.

In addition, I asked the immediate revocation of the order of reconcentration, so as to permit the people to return to their farms and the needy to be relieved with provisions and supplies from the United States, cooperating with the Spanish authorities, so as to afford full relief.

The reply of the Spanish cabinet was received on the night of the 31st ultimo. It offered, as the means to bring about peace in Cuba, to confide the preparation thereof to the Insular Parliament, inasmuch as the concurrence of that body would be necessary to reach a final result, it being, however, understood that the powers reserved by the constitution to the Central Government are not lessened or diminished. As the Cuban Parliament does not meet until the 4th of May next, the Spanish Government would not object, for its part, to accept at once a suspension of hostilities if asked for by the insurgents from the general in chief, to whom it would pertain, in such case, to determine the duration and conditions of the armistice.

The propositions submitted by General Woodford and the reply of the Spanish Government were both in the form of brief memoranda, the texts of which are before me, and are substantially in the language above given. The function of the Cuban Parliament in the matter of "preparing" peace and the manner of its doing so are not expressed in the Spanish memorandum; but from General Woodford's explanatory reports of preliminary discussions preceding the final conference it is understood that the Spanish Government stands ready to give the Insular Congress full powers to settle the terms of peace with the insurgents—whether by direct negotiation or indirectly by means of legislation does not appear.

With this last overture in the direction of immediate peace, and its disappointing reception by Spain, the Executive is brought to the end of his effort.

In my annual message of December last I said: "Of the untied measures there remain only: Recognition of the insurgents as belligerents; recognition of the independence of Cuba; neutral intervention to end the war by imposing a rational compromise between the contestants, and intervention in favor of one or the other party. I speak not of forcible annexation, for that can not be thought of. That, by our code of morality, would be criminal aggression."

Thereupon I reviewed these alternatives, in the light of President Grant's measured words, uttered in 1875, when after seven years of sanguinary, destructive, and cruel hostilities in Cuba he reached the conclusion that the recognition of the independence of Cuba was impracticable and indefensible; and that the recognition of belligerence was not warranted by the facts according to the tests of public law. I commented especially upon the latter aspect of the question, pointing out the inconveniences and positive dangers of a recognition of belligerence which, while adding to the already onerous burdens of neutrality within our own jurisdiction, could not in any way extend our influence or effective offices in the territory of hostilities.

Nothing has since occurred to change my view in this regard; and I recognize as fully now as then that the issuance of a proclamation of neutrality, by which process the so-called recognition of belligerents is published, could, of itself and unattended by other action, accomplish nothing toward the one end for which we labor—the instant pacification of Cuba and the cessation of the misery that afflicts the island.

Turning to the question of recognizing at this time the independence of the present insurgent government in Cuba, we find safe precedents in our history from an early day. They are well summed up in President Jackson's message to Congress, December 21, 1836, on the subject of the recognition of the independence of Texas. He said:

"In all the contests that have arisen out of the revolutions of France, out of the disputes relating to the Crowns of Portugal and Spain, out of the separation of the American possessions of both from the European Governments, and out of the numerous and constantly occurring struggles for dominion in Spanish America, so wisely consistent with our just principles has been the action of our Government that we have, under the most critical circumstances, avoided all censures, and encountered no other evil than that produced by a transient estrangement of good will in those against whom we have been by force of evidence compelled to decide.

"It has thus made known to the world that the uniform policy and practice of the United States is to avoid all interference in disputes which merely relate to the internal government of other nations, and eventually to recognize the authority of the prevailing party without reference to our particular interests and views or to the merits of the original controversy."

"* * * But on this, as on every other trying occasion, safety is to be found in a rigid adherence to principle.

"In the contest between Spain and the revolted colonies we stood aloof, and waited not only until the ability of the new States to protect themselves was fully established, but until the danger of their being again subjugated had entirely passed away. Then, and not until then, were they recognized."

"Such was our course in regard to Mexico herself. * * * It is true that with regard to Texas the civil authority of Mexico has been expelled, its invading army

defeated, the chief of the Republic himself captured, and all present power to control the newly-organized government of Texas annihilated within its confines; but, on the other hand, there is, in appearance at least, an immense disparity of physical force on the side of Texas. The Mexican Republic, under another Executive, is rallying its forces under a new leader and menacing a fresh invasion to recover its lost dominion.

"Upon the issue of this threatened invasion the independence of Texas may be considered as suspended; and were there nothing peculiar in the relative situation of the United States and Texas, our acknowledgment of its independence at such a crisis could scarcely be regarded as consistent with that prudent reserve with which we have hitherto held ourselves bound to treat all similar questions."

Thereupon Andrew Jackson proceeded to consider the risk that there might be imputed to the United States motives of selfish interest in view of the former claim on our part to the territory of Texas, and of the avowed purpose of the Texans in seeking recognition of independence as an incident to the incorporation of Texas in the Union, concluding thus:

"Prudence, therefore, seems to dictate that we should still stand aloof and maintain our present attitude, if not until Mexico itself or one of the great foreign powers shall recognize the independence of the new government, at least until the lapse of time or the course of events shall have proved beyond cavil or dispute the ability of the people of that country to maintain their separate sovereignty and to uphold the government constituted by them. Neither of the contending parties can justly complain of this course. By pursuing it we are but carrying out the long-established policy of our Government, a policy which has secured to us respect and influence abroad and inspired confidence at home."

These are the words of the resolute and patriotic Jackson. They are evidence that the United States, in addition to the test imposed by public law as the condition of the recognition of independence by a neutral state (to wit, that the revolted state shall "constitute in fact a body politic, having a government in substance as well as in name, possessed of the elements of stability," and forming de facto, "if left to itself, a state among the nations, reasonably capable of discharging the duties of a state"), has imposed for its own governance in dealing with cases like these the further condition that recognition of independent statehood is not due to a revolted dependency until the danger of its being again subjugated by the parent state has entirely passed away.

This extreme test was, in fact, applied in the case of Texas. The Congress, to whom President Jackson referred the question as one "probably leading to war," and therefore a proper subject for "a previous understanding with that body, by whom war can alone be declared, and by whom all the provisions for sustaining its perils must be furnished," left the matter of the recognition of Texas to the discretion of the Executive, providing merely for the sending of a diplomatic agent when the President should be satisfied that the Republic of Texas had become "an independent State." It was so recognized by President Van Buren, who commissioned a chargé d'affaires March 7, 1837, after Mexico had abandoned an attempt to reconquer the Texan territory, and when there was at the time no bona fide contest going on between the insurgent province and its former sovereign.

I said in my message of December last, "It is to be seriously considered whether the Cuban insurrection possesses beyond dispute the attributes of statehood which alone can demand the recognition of belligerency in its favor." The same requirement must certainly be no less seriously considered when the graver issue of recognizing independence is in question, for no less positive test can be applied to the greater act than to the lesser; while, on the other hand, the influences and consequences of the struggle upon the internal policy of the recognizing State, which form important factors when the recognition of belligerency is concerned, are secondary, if not rightly eliminable, factors when the real question is whether the community claiming recognition is or is not independent beyond peradventure.

Nor from the standpoint of expediency do I think it would be wise or prudent for this Government to recognize at the present time the independence of the so-called Cuban republic. Such recognition is not necessary in order to enable the United States to intervene and pacify the island. To commit this country now to the recognition of any particular government in Cuba might subject us to embarrassing conditions of international obligation toward the organization so recognized. In case of intervention our conduct would be subject to the approval or disapproval of such government. We would be required to submit to its direction and to assume to it the mere relation of a friendly ally.

When it shall appear hereafter that there is within the island a government capable of performing the duties and discharging the functions of a separate nation, and having, as a matter of fact, the proper forms and attributes of nationality, such government can be promptly and readily recognized and the relations and interests of the United States with such nation adjusted.

There remain the alternative forms of intervention to end the war, either as an impartial neutral by imposing a rational compromise between the contestants, or as the active ally of the one party or the other.

As to the first, it is not to be forgotten that during the last few months the relation of the United States has virtually been one of friendly intervention in many ways, each not of itself conclusive, but all tending to the exertion of a potential influence toward an ultimate pacific result, just and honorable to all interests concerned. The spirit of all our acts hitherto has been an earnest, unselfish desire for peace and prosperity in Cuba, untarnished by differences between us and Spain, and unstained by the blood of American citizens.

The forcible intervention of the United States as a neutral to stop the war, according to the large dictates of humanity and following many historical precedents where neighboring States have interfered to check the hopeless sacrifices of life by internecine conflicts beyond their borders, is justifiable on rational grounds. It involves, however, hostile constraint upon both the parties to the contest as well to enforce a truce as to guide the eventual settlement.

The grounds for such intervention may be briefly summarized as follows:

First. In the cause of humanity and to put an end to the barbarities, bloodshed, starvation, and horrible miseries now existing there, and which the parties to the conflict are either unable or unwilling to stop or mitigate. It is no answer to say this is all in another country, belonging to another nation, and is therefore none of our business. It is specially our duty, for it is right at our door.

Second. We owe it to our citizens in Cuba to afford them that protection and indemnity for life and property which no government there can or will afford, and to that end to terminate the conditions that deprive them of legal protection.

Third. The right to intervene may be justified by the very serious injury to the commerce, trade, and business of our people, and by the wanton destruction of property and devastation of the island.

Fourth, and which is of the utmost importance. The present condition of affairs in Cuba is a constant menace to our peace, and entails upon this Government an enormous expense. With such a conflict waged for years in an island so near us, and with which our people have such trade and business relations—when the lives and liberty of our citizens are in constant danger and their property destroyed and themselves ruined—where our trading vessels are liable to seizure and are seized at our very door by war ships of a foreign nation, the expeditions of filibustering that we are powerless to prevent altogether, and the irritating questions and entanglements thus arising—all these, and others that I need not mention, with the resulting strained relations, are a constant menace to our peace, and compel us to keep on a semiwar footing with a nation with which we are at peace.

These elements of danger and disorder already pointed out have been strikingly illustrated by a tragic event which has deeply and justly moved the Amer-

ican people. I have already transmitted to Congress the report of the naval court of inquiry on the destruction of the battle ship *Maine* in the harbor of Habana during the night of the 15th of February. The destruction of that noble vessel has filled the national heart with inexpressible horror. Two hundred and fifty-eight brave sailors and marines and two officers of our Navy, reposing in the fancied security of a friendly harbor, have been hurled to death, grief and want brought to their homes and sorrow to the nation.

The naval court of inquiry, which, it is needless to say, commands the unqualified confidence of the Government, was unanimous in its conclusion that the destruction of the *Maine* was caused by an exterior explosion, that of a submarine mine. It did not assume to place the responsibility. That remains to be fixed.

In any event the destruction of the *Maine*, by whatever exterior cause, is a patent and impressive proof of a state of things in Cuba that is intolerable. That condition is thus shown to be such that the Spanish Government can not assure safety and security to a vessel of the American Navy in the harbor of Habana on a mission of peace, and rightfully there.

Further referring in this connection to recent diplomatic correspondence, a dispatch from our minister to Spain, of the 26th ultimo, contained the statement that the Spanish minister for foreign affairs assured him positively that Spain will do all that the highest honor and justice require in the matter of the *Maine*. The reply above referred to of the 31st ultimo also contained an expression of the readiness of Spain to submit to an arbitration all the differences which can arise in this matter, which is subsequently explained by the note of the Spanish minister at Washington of the 10th instant, as follows:

"As to the question of fact which springs from the diversity of views between the reports of the American and Spanish boards, Spain proposes that the facts be ascertained by an impartial investigation by experts, whose decision Spain accepts in advance."

To this I have made no reply.

President Grant, in 1875, after discussing the phases of the contest as it then appeared, and its hopeless and apparent indefinite prolongation, said:

"In such an event, I am of opinion that other nations will be compelled to assume the responsibility which devolves upon them, and to seriously consider the only remaining measures possible—mediation and intervention. Owing, perhaps, to the large expanse of water separating the island from the peninsula, the contending parties appear to have within themselves no depository of common confidence, to suggest wisdom when passion and excitement have their sway, and to assume the part of peacemaker."

"In this view in the earlier days of the contest the good offices of the United States as a mediator were tendered in good faith, without any selfish purpose, in the interest of humanity and in sincere friendship for both parties, but were at the time declined by Spain, with the declaration, nevertheless, that at a future time they would be indispensable. No intimation has been received that in the opinion of Spain that time has been reached. And yet the strife continues with all its dread horrors and all its injuries to the interests of the United States and of other nations."

"Each party seems quite capable of working great injury and damage to the other, as well as to all the relations and interests dependent on the existence of peace in the island; but they seem incapable of reaching any adjustment, and both have thus far failed of achieving any success whereby one party shall possess and control the island to the exclusion of the other. Under these circumstances, the agency of others, either by mediation or by intervention, seems to be the only alternative which must sooner or later be invoked for the termination of the strife."

In the last annual message of my immediate predecessor during the pending struggle, it was said:

"When the inability of Spain to deal successfully with the insurrection has become manifest, and it is demonstrated that her sovereignty is extinct in Cuba for all purposes of its rightful existence, and when a hopeless struggle for its reestablishment has degenerated into a strife which means nothing more than the useless sacrifice of human life and the utter destruction of the very subject-matter of the conflict, a situation will be presented in which our obligations to the sovereignty of Spain will be superseded by higher obligations, which we can hardly hesitate to recognize and discharge."

In my annual message to Congress, December last, speaking to this question, I said:

"The near future will demonstrate whether the indispensable condition of a righteous peace, just alike to the Cubans and to Spain, as well as equitable to all our interests so intimately involved in the welfare of Cuba, is likely to be attained. If not, the exigency of further and other action by the United States will remain to be taken. When that time comes that action will be determined in the line of indisputable right and duty. It will be faced, without misgiving or hesitancy, in the light of the obligation this Government owes to itself, to the people who have confided to it the protection of their interests and honor, and to humanity."

"Sure of the right, keeping free from all offense ourselves, actuated only by upright and patriotic considerations, moved neither by passion nor selfishness, the Government will continue its watchful care over the rights and property of American citizens and will abate none of its efforts to bring about by peaceful agencies a peace which shall be honorable and enduring. If it shall hereafter appear to be a duty imposed by our obligations to ourselves, to civilization, and humanity to intervene with force, it shall be without fault on our part, and only because the necessity for such action will be so clear as to command the support and approval of the civilized world."

The long trial has proved that the object for which Spain has waged the war can not be attained. The fire of insurrection may flame or may smolder with varying seasons, but it has not been and it is plain that it can not be extinguished by present methods. The only hope of relief and repose from a condition which can no longer be endured is the enforced pacification of Cuba. In the name of humanity, in the name of civilization, in behalf of endangered American interests which give us the right and the duty to speak and to act, the war in Cuba must stop.

In view of these facts and of these considerations, I ask the Congress to authorize and empower the President to take measures to secure a full and final termination of hostilities between the Government of Spain and the people of Cuba, and to secure in the island the establishment of a stable government, capable of maintaining order and observing its international obligations, insuring peace and tranquility and the security of its citizens as well as our own, and to use the military and naval forces of the United States as may be necessary for these purposes.

And in the interest of humanity and to aid in preserving the lives of the starving people of the island I recommend that the distribution of food and supplies be continued, and that an appropriation be made out of the public Treasury to supplement the charity of our citizens.

The issue is now with the Congress. It is a solemn responsibility. I have exhausted every effort to relieve the intolerable condition of affairs which is at our doors. Prepared to execute every obligation imposed upon me by the Constitution and the law, I await your action.

Yesterday, and since the preparation of the foregoing message, official information was received by me that the latest decree of the Queen Regent of Spain directs General Blanco, in order to prepare and facilitate peace, to proclaim a suspension of hostilities, the duration and details of which have not yet been communicated to me.

This fact with every other pertinent consideration will, I am sure, have your just and careful attention in the solemn deliberations upon which you are about to enter. If this measure attains a successful result, then our aspirations as a Christian, peace-loving people will be realized. If it fails, it will be only another justification for our contemplated action.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, April 11, 1898.

APPENDIX 2.

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas, by a joint resolution passed by the Congress and approved April 20, 1898, and communicated to the Government of Spain, it was demanded that said Government at once relinquish its authority and Government in the Island of Cuba, and withdraw its land and Naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters; and the President of the United States was directed and empowered to use the entire land and Naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States to such an extent as might be necessary to carry said resolution into effect; and

Whereas, in carrying into effect said resolution, the President of the United States deems it necessary to set on foot and maintain a blockade of the north coast of Cuba, including all ports on said coast between Cardenas and Bahia Honda and the port of Cienfuegos on the south coast of Cuba:

Now, therefore, I, William McKinley, President of the United States, in order to enforce the said resolution, do hereby declare and proclaim that the United States of America have instituted and will maintain a blockade of the north coast of Cuba, including ports on said coast between Cardenas and Bahia Honda and the port of Cienfuegos on the south coast of Cuba, aforesaid, in pursuance of the laws of the United States and the law of nations applicable to such cases. An efficient force will be posted so as to prevent the entrance and exit of vessels from the ports aforesaid. Any neutral vessel approaching any of said ports, or attempting to leave the same, without notice or knowledge of the establishment of such blockade, will be duly warned by the commander of the blockading forces, who will indorse on her register the fact and the date of such warning, where such indorsement was made; and if the same vessel shall again attempt to enter any blockaded port, she will be captured and sent to the nearest convenient port for such proceedings against her and her cargo as prize, as may be deemed advisable.

Neutral vessels lying in any of said ports at the time of the establishment of such blockade will be allowed thirty days to issue therefrom.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this 23d day of April, A. D. 1898, and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and twenty-second.

[SEAL.]

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

By the President:

JOHN SHERMAN,
Secretary of State.

APPENDIX 3.

[Existence of war—Spain.]

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas by an act of Congress approved April 25, 1898, it is declared that war exists and that war has existed since the 21st day of April, A. D. 1898, including said day, between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain; and

Whereas, it being desirable that such war should be conducted upon principles in harmony with the present views of nations and sanctioned by their recent practice, it has already been announced that the policy of this Government will be not to resort to privateering, but to adhere to the rules of the Declaration of Paris:

Now, therefore, I, William McKinley, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the power vested in me by the Constitution and the laws, do hereby declare and proclaim:

1. The neutral flag covers enemy's goods, with the exception of contraband of war.

2. Neutral goods, not contraband of war, are not liable to confiscation under the enemy's flag.

3. Blockades in order to be binding must be effective.

4. Spanish merchant vessels, in any ports or places within the United States, shall be allowed till May 21, 1898, inclusive, for loading their cargoes and departing from such ports or places; and such Spanish merchant vessels, if met at sea by any United States ship, shall be permitted to continue their voyage, if, on examination of their papers, it shall appear that their cargoes were taken on board before the expiration of the above term; provided, that nothing herein contained shall apply to Spanish vessels having on board any officer in the military or naval service of the enemy, or any coal (except such as may be necessary for their voyage), or any other article prohibited or contraband of war, or any dispatch of or to the Spanish Government.

5. Any Spanish merchant vessel which, prior to April 21, 1898, shall have sailed from any foreign port bound for any port or place in the United States, shall be permitted to enter such port or place, and to discharge her cargo, and afterward forthwith to depart without molestation; and any such vessel, if met at sea by any United States ship, shall be permitted to continue her voyage to any port not blockaded.

6. The right of search is to be exercised with strict regard for the rights of neutrals, and the voyages of mail steamers are not to be interfered with except on the clearest grounds of suspicion of a violation of law in respect of contraband or blockade.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, on the twenty-sixth day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and twenty-second.

[SEAL.]

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

By the President:

ALVEY A. ADEE,
Acting Secretary of State.

APPENDIX 4.

[Call for volunteers—Spain.]

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas a joint resolution of Congress was approved on the 20th day of April, 1898, entitled "Joint resolution for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect;" and

Whereas, by an act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for temporarily increasing the military establishment of the United States in time of war, and for other purposes," approved April 22, 1898, the President is authorized, in order to

raise a volunteer army, to issue his proclamation calling for volunteers to serve in the Army of the United States:

Now, therefore, I, William McKinley, President of the United States, by virtue of the power vested in me by the Constitution and the laws, and deeming sufficient occasion to exist, have thought fit to call forth, and hereby do call forth, volunteers to the aggregate number of 125,000, in order to carry into effect the purpose of the said resolution; the same to be apportioned, as far as practicable, among the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia, according to population, and to serve for two years, unless sooner discharged. The details for this object will be immediately communicated to the proper authorities through the War Department.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this twenty-third day of April, A. D. 1898, and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and twenty-second.

[SEAL.]

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

By the President:

JOHN SHERMAN,
Secretary of State.

APPENDIX 5.

[Second call for volunteers—Spain.]

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas an act of Congress was approved on the twenty-fifth day of April, 1898, entitled "An act declaring that war exists between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain," and

Whereas, by an act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for temporarily increasing the military establishment of the United States in time of war and for other purposes," approved April 22, 1898; the President is authorized, in order to raise a volunteer army, to issue his proclamation calling for volunteers to serve in the Army of the United States:

Now, therefore, I, William McKinley, President of the United States, by virtue of the power vested in me by the Constitution and the laws, and deeming sufficient occasion to exist, have thought fit to call forth and hereby do call forth, volunteers to the aggregate number of 75,000 in addition to the volunteers called forth by my proclamation of the twenty-third of April in the present year, the same to be apportioned, as far as practical, among the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia, according to population, and to serve for two years, unless sooner discharged. The proportion of each arm and the details of enlistment and organization will be made known through the War Department.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington, this twenty-fifth day of May, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and twenty-second.

[SEAL.]

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

By the President:

WILLIAM R. DAY,
Secretary of State.

APPENDIX 6.

[Blockade—Southern Cuba and San Juan, Porto Rico.]

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas, for the reasons set forth in my proclamation of April 22, 1898, a blockade of the ports on the northern coast of Cuba, from Cardenas to Bahia Honda, inclusive, and of the port of Cienfuegos, on the south coast of Cuba, was declared to have been instituted; and

Whereas, it has become desirable to extend the blockade to other Spanish ports:

Now, therefore, I, William McKinley, President of the United States, do hereby declare and proclaim that, in addition to the blockade of the ports specified in my proclamation of April 22, 1898, the United States of America has instituted and will maintain an effective blockade of all the ports on the south coast of Cuba, from Cape Frances to Cape Cruz, inclusive, and also of the port of San Juan, in the island of Porto Rico.

Neutral vessels lying in any of the ports to which the blockade is by the present proclamation extended, will be allowed thirty days to issue therefrom, with cargo.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this twenty-seventh day of June, A. D. 1898, and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and twenty-second.

[SEAL.]

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

By the President:

J. B. MOORE,
Acting Secretary of State.

APPENDIX 7.

[Telegram.]

ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, July 18, 1898—6.30 p. m.

General SHAFTER, Santiago, Cuba:

The following is sent you for your information and guidance. It will be published in such manner, in both English and Spanish, as will give it the widest circulation in the territory under your control:

"THE SECRETARY OF WAR.

"SIR: The capitulation of the Spanish forces in Santiago de Cuba and in the eastern part of the province of Santiago, and the occupation of the territory by the forces of the United States as to the conduct which he is to observe during the military occupation.

"The first effect of the military occupation of the enemy's territory is the severance of the former political relations of the inhabitants and the establishment of a new political power. Under this changed condition of things the inhabitants, so long as they perform their duties, are entitled to security in their persons and property, and in all their private rights and relations. It is my desire that the inhabitants of Cuba should be acquainted with the purpose of the United States to discharge to the fullest extent its obligation in this regard. It will therefore be the duty of the commander of the army of occupation to announce and proclaim, in the most public manner, that we come not to make war upon the inhabitants of Cuba, nor upon any party or faction among them, but to protect them in their homes, in their employments, and in their personal and religious rights. All persons who, either by active aid or by honest submission, cooperate with the United States in its efforts to give effect to this beneficent

purpose will receive the reward of its support and protection. Our occupation should be as free from severity as possible.

"Though the powers of the military occupant are absolute and supreme, and immediately operate upon the political condition of the inhabitants, the municipal laws of the conquered territory, such as affect private rights of person and property and provide for the punishment of crime, are considered as continuing in force, so far as they are compatible with the new order of things, until they are suspended or superseded by the occupying belligerent; and in practice they are not usually abrogated, but are allowed to remain in force, and to be administered by the ordinary tribunals, substantially as they were before the occupation. This enlightened practice is, so far as possible, to be adhered to on the present occasion. The judges and the other officials connected with the administration of justice may, if they accept the supremacy of the United States, continue to administer the ordinary law of the land, as between man and man, under the supervision of the American commander in chief.

"The native constabulary will, so far as may be practicable, be preserved. The freedom of the people to pursue their accustomed occupations will be abridged only when it may be necessary to do so.

"While the rule of conduct of the American commander in chief will be such as has just been defined, it will be his duty to adopt measures of a different kind if, unfortunately, the course of the people should render such measures indispensable to the maintenance of law and order. He will then possess the power to replace or expel the native officials in part or altogether, to substitute new courts of his own constitution for those that now exist, or to create such new or supplementary tribunals as may be necessary. In the exercise of these high powers the commander must be guided by his judgment and his experience and a high sense of justice.

"One of the most important and most practical problems with which it will be necessary to deal is that of the treatment of property and the collection and administration of the revenues. It is conceded that all public funds and securities belonging to the government of the country in its own right, and all arms and supplies and other movable property of such government, may be seized by the military occupant and converted to his own use. The real property of the state he may hold and administer, at the same time enjoying the revenues thereof, but he is not to destroy it save in the case of military necessity. All public means of transportation, such as telegraph lines, cables, railways, and boats, belonging to the state may be appropriated to his use, but, unless in case of military necessity, they are not to be destroyed. All churches and buildings devoted to religious worship and to the arts and sciences, all schoolhouses, are, so far as possible, to be protected, and all destruction or intentional defacement of such places, of historical monuments or archives, or of works of science or art is prohibited, save when required by urgent military necessity.

"Private property, whether belonging to individuals or corporations, is to be respected, and can be confiscated only for cause. Means of transportation, such as telegraph lines and cables, railways and boats, may, although they belong to private individuals or corporations, be seized by the military occupant, but unless destroyed under military necessity are not to be retained.

"While it is held to be the right of the conqueror to levy contributions upon the enemy in their reports, towns, or provinces which may be in his military possession by conquest, and to apply the proceeds to defray the expense of the war, this right is to be exercised within such limitations that it may not savor of confiscation. As the result of military occupation the taxes and duties payable by the inhabitants to the former government become payable to the military occupant, unless he sees fit to substitute for them other rates or modes of contribution to the expenses of the government. The moneys so collected are to be used for the purpose of paying the expenses of government under the military occupation, such as the salaries of the judges and the police, and for the payment of the expenses of the Army.

"Private property taken for the use of the Army is to be paid for, when possible, in cash at a fair valuation, and when payment in cash is not possible receipts are to be given.

"All ports and places in Cuba which may be in the actual possession of our land and naval forces will be opened to the commerce of all neutral nations, as well as our own, in articles not contraband of war, upon payment of the prescribed rates of duty which may be in force at the time of the importation.

"WILLIAM MCKINLEY."

By order Secretary of War:

H. C. CORBIN, *Adjutant-General.*

APPENDIX 8.

[Spain—suspension of hostilities.]

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas, by a protocol concluded and signed August 12, 1898, by William R. Day, Secretary of State of the United States, and his excellency Jules Cambon, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Republic of France at Washington, respectively representing for this purpose the Government of the United States and the Government of Spain, the United States and Spain have formally agreed upon the terms on which negotiations for the establishment of peace between the two countries shall be undertaken; and

Whereas it is in said protocol agreed that upon its conclusion and signature hostilities between the two countries shall be suspended, and that notice to that effect shall be given as soon as possible by each Government to the commanders of its military and naval forces;

Now, therefore, I, William McKinley, President of the United States, do, in accordance with the stipulations of the protocol, declare and proclaim on the part of the United States a suspension of hostilities, and do hereby command that orders be immediately given through the proper channels to the commanders of the military and naval forces of the United States to abstain from all acts inconsistent with this proclamation.

In witness thereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this 12th day of August, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and twenty-third.

[SEAL.]

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

By the President:

WILLIAM R. DAY,
Secretary of State.

APPENDIX 9.

PROTOCOL.

William R. Day, Secretary of State of the United States, and His Excellency Jules Cambon, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of France at Washington, respectively possessing for this purpose full authority from the Government of the United States and the Government of Spain, have concluded and signed the following articles, embodying the terms on which the two Governments have agreed in respect to the matters hereinafter set forth, having in view the establishment of peace between the two countries, that is to say:

ARTICLE I.

Spain will relinquish all claim of sovereignty over and title to Cuba.

ARTICLE II.

Spain will cede to the United States the island of Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies, and also an island in the Ladrones to be selected by the United States.

ARTICLE III.

The United States will occupy and hold the city, bay and harbor of Manila, pending the conclusion of a treaty of peace which shall determine the control, disposition and government of the Philippines.

ARTICLE IV.

Spain will immediately evacuate Cuba, Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies; and to this end each Government will, within ten days after the signing of this protocol, appoint Commissioners, and the Commissioners so appointed shall, within thirty days after the signing of this protocol, meet at Havana for the purpose of arranging and carrying out the details of the aforesaid evacuation of Cuba and the adjacent Spanish islands; and each Government will, within ten days after the signing of this protocol, also appoint other Commissioners, who shall, within thirty days after the signing of this protocol, meet at San Juan, in Porto Rico, for the purpose of arranging and carrying out the details of the aforesaid evacuation of Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies.

ARTICLE V.

The United States and Spain will each appoint not more than five commissioners to treat of peace, and the commissioners so appointed shall meet at Paris not later than October 1, 1898, and proceed to the negotiation and conclusion of a treaty of peace, which treaty shall be subject to ratification according to the respective constitutional forms of the two countries.

ARTICLE VI.

Upon the conclusion and signing of this protocol, hostilities between the two countries shall be suspended, and notice to that effect shall be given as soon as possible by each Government to the commanders of its military and naval forces.

Done at Washington in duplicate, in English and in French, by the undersigned, who have hereunto set their hands and seals, the 12th day of August, 1898.

[SEAL.]
[SEAL.]

WILLIAM R. DAY,
JULES CAMBON.

APPENDIX 10.

[Circular No. 4. Division of Customs and Insular Affairs.]

WAR DEPARTMENT, Washington, January 16, 1899.

The following order of the President is published for the information and guidance of all concerned:

EXECUTIVE MANSION, Washington, December 21, 1898.

THE SECRETARY OF WAR.

SIR: The destruction of the Spanish fleet in the harbor of Manila by the United States naval squadron commanded by Real-Admiral Dewey, followed by the reduction of the city and the surrender of the Spanish forces, practically effected the conquest of the Philippine Islands and the suspension of Spanish sovereignty therein.

With the signature of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain by their respective plenipotentiaries at Paris on the 10th instant, and as the result of the victories of American arms, the future control, disposition, and government of the Philippine Islands are ceded to the United States. In fulfillment of the rights of sovereignty thus acquired, and the responsible obligations of government thus assumed, the actual occupation and administration of the entire group of the Philippine Islands becomes immediately necessary, and the military government heretofore maintained by the United States in the city, harbor, and bay of Manila is to be extended with all possible dispatch to the whole of the ceded territory.

In performing this duty the military commander of the United States is enjoined to make known to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands that, in succeeding to the sovereignty of Spain, in severing the former political relations of the inhabitants, and in establishing a new political power, the authority of the United States is to be exerted for the security of the persons and property of the people of the islands and for the confirmation of all their private rights and relations. It will be the duty of the commander of the forces of occupation to announce and proclaim in the most public manner that we come, not as invaders or conquerors, but as friends, to protect the natives in their homes, in their employments, and in their personal and religious rights. All persons who, either by active aid or by honest submission, cooperate with the Government of the United States to give effect to these beneficent purposes, will receive the reward of its support and protection. All others will be brought within the lawful rule we have assumed, with firmness if need be, but without severity so far as may be possible.

Within the absolute domain of military authority, which necessarily is and must remain supreme in the ceded territory until the legislation of the United States shall otherwise provide, the municipal laws of the territory, in respect to private rights and property and the repression of crime are to be considered as continuing in force, and to be administered by the ordinary tribunals so far as practicable. The operations of civil and municipal government are to be performed by such officers as may accept the supremacy of the United States by taking the oath of allegiance, or by officers chosen as far as may be practicable from the inhabitants of the islands.

While the control of all the public property and the revenues of the State passes with the cession, and while the use and management of all public means of transportation are necessarily reserved to the authority of the United States, private property, whether belonging to individuals or corporations, is to be respected, except for cause duly established. The taxes and duties heretofore payable by the inhabitants to the late Government become payable to the authorities of the United States, unless it be seen fit to substitute for them other reasonable rates or modes of contribution to the expenses of government, whether general or local. If private property be taken for military use, it shall be paid for when possible in cash, at a fair valuation, and when payment in cash is not practicable, receipts are to be given.

All ports and places in the Philippine Islands in the actual possession of the land and naval forces of the United States will be opened to the commerce of all friendly nations. All goods and wares, not prohibited for military reasons by due announcement of the military authority, will be admitted upon payment of such duties and other charges as shall be in force at the time of their importation.

Finally, it should be the earnest and paramount aim of the military administration to win the confidence, respect, and affection of the inhabitants of the Philippines by assuring to them in every possible way that full measure of individual rights and liberties which is the heritage of free peoples, and by proving to them that the mission of the United States is one of benevolent assimilation, substituting the mild way of justice and right for arbitrary rule. In the fulfillment of this high mission, supporting the temporary administration of affairs for the greatest good of the governed, there must be sedulously maintained the strong arm of authority, to repress disturbance and to overcome all obstacles to

the bestowal of the blessings of good and stable government upon the people of the Philippine Islands under the free flag of the United States.

This order will be duly proclaimed and enforced.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY,
G. D. MEIKLEJOHN,
Assistant Secretary of War.

APPENDIX 11. PROCLAMATION.

To the people of the Philippine Islands:

The treaty of peace between the United States and Spain, ratified several weeks ago by the former, having on March 20 been ratified by the latter, the cession to the United States, as stipulated by the treaty, of the sovereignty which Spain possessed and exercised over the Philippine Islands has now, in accordance with the laws of nations, received a complete and indefeasible consummation.

In order that the high responsibilities and obligations with which the United States has thus become definitely charged may be fulfilled in a way calculated to promote the best interests of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, His Excellency, the President of the United States, has appointed the undersigned a civil commission on Philippine affairs, clothing them with all the powers necessary for the exercise of that office.

The Commission desire to assure the people of the Philippine Islands of the cordial good will and fraternal feeling which is entertained for them by His Excellency the President of the United States and by the American people. The aim and object of the American Government, apart from the fulfillment of the solemn obligations it has assumed toward the family of nations by the acceptance of sovereignty over the Philippine Islands, is the well-being, the prosperity, and the happiness of the Philippine people, and their elevation and advancement to a position among the most civilized peoples of the world.

His Excellency the President of the United States believes that this felicity and perfection of the Philippine people is to be brought about by the assurance of peace and order; by the guaranty of civil and religious liberty; by the establishment of justice; by the cultivation of letters, science, and the liberal and practical arts; by the enlargement of intercourse with foreign nations; by the expansion of industrial pursuits, trade, and commerce; by the multiplication and improvement of the means of internal communication; by the development, with the aid of modern mechanical inventions, of the great natural resources of the archipelago; and, in a word, by the uninterrupted devotion of the people to the pursuit of those useful objects and the realization of those noble ideals which constitute the higher civilization of mankind.

Unfortunately, the pure aims and purposes of the American Government and people have been misinterpreted to some of the inhabitants of certain of the islands. As a consequence, the friendly American forces have, without provocation or cause, been openly attacked.

And why these hostilities? What do the best Filipinos desire? Can it be more than the United States is ready to give? They are patriots and want liberty, it is said. The Commission emphatically asserts that the United States is not only willing, but anxious, to establish in the Philippine Islands an enlightened system of government under which the Philippine people may enjoy the largest measure of home rule and the amplest liberty consonant with the supreme ends of government and compatible with those obligations which the United States has assumed toward the civilized nations of the world.

The United States striving earnestly for the welfare and advancement of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, there can be no real conflict between American sovereignty and the rights and liberties of the Philippine people. For, just as the United States stands ready to furnish armies, navies, and all the infinite resources of a great and powerful nation to maintain and support its rightful supremacy over the Philippine Islands, so it is even more solicitous to spread peace and happiness among the Philippine people; to guarantee them a rightful freedom; to protect them in their just privileges and immunities; to accustom them to free self-government in an ever-increasing measure; and to encourage them in those democratic aspirations, sentiments, and ideals which are the promise and potency of a fruitful national development.

It is the expectation of the commission to visit the Philippine people in their respective provinces, both for the purpose of cultivating a more intimate mutual acquaintance and also with a view to ascertaining from enlightened native opinion what form or forms of government seem best adapted to the Philippine peoples, most apt to conduce to their highest welfare, and most conformable to their customs, traditions, sentiments, and cherished ideals. Both in the establishment and maintenance of government in the Philippine Islands, it will be the policy of the United States to consult the views and wishes, and to secure the advice, cooperation, and aid of the Philippine people themselves.

In the meantime the attention of the Philippine people is invited to certain regulative principles by which the United States will be guided in its relations with them. The following are deemed of cardinal importance:

1. The supremacy of the United States must and will be enforced throughout every part of the archipelago, and those who resist it can accomplish no end other than their own ruin.
2. The most ample liberty of self-government will be granted to the Philippine people which is reconcilable with the maintenance of a wise, just, stable, effective, and economical administration of public affairs and compatible with the sovereign and international rights and obligations of the United States.
3. The civil rights of the Philippine people will be guaranteed and protected to the fullest extent, religious freedom assured, and all persons shall have an equal standing before the law.
4. Honor, justice, and friendship forbid the use of the Philippine people or Islands as an object or means of exploitation. The purpose of the American Government is the welfare and advancement of the Philippine people.
5. There shall be guaranteed to the Philippine people an honest and effective civil service, in which, to the fullest extent practicable, natives shall be employed.
6. The collection and application of taxes and revenues will be put upon a sound, honest, and economical basis. Public funds, raised justly and collected honestly, will be applied only in defraying the regular and proper expenses incurred by and for the establishment and maintenance of the Philippine government and for such general improvements as public interests may demand. Local funds, collected for local purposes, shall not be diverted to other ends. With such a prudent and honest fiscal administration, it is believed that the needs of the government will in a short time become compatible with a considerable reduction in taxation.
7. A pure, speedy, and effective administration of justice will be established whereby the evils of delay, corruption, and exploitation will be effectually eradicated.
8. The construction of roads, railroads, and other means of communication and transportation, as well as other public works of manifest advantage to the Philippine people, will be promoted.
9. Domestic and foreign trade and commerce, agriculture, and other industrial pursuits, and the general development of the country in the interest of its inhabitants will be constant objects of solicitude and fostering care.
10. Effective provision will be made for the establishment of elementary schools in which the children of the people shall be educated. Appropriate facilities will also be provided for higher education.
11. Reforms in all departments of the government, in all branches of the public service, and in all corporations closely touching the common life of the people, must be undertaken without delay and effected, conformably to right and justice,

in a way that will satisfy the well-founded demands and the highest sentiments and aspirations of the Philippine people.

Such is the spirit in which the United States comes to the people of the Philippine Islands. His Excellency the President has instructed the commission to make it publicly known. And in obeying this behest, the commission desire to join with His Excellency the President in expressing their own good will toward the Philippine people, and to extend to their leading and representative men a cordial invitation to meet them for personal acquaintance and for the exchange of views and opinions.

JACOB GOULD SCHURMAN,
President of Commission.
GEORGE DEWEY,
Admiral U. S. N.
ELWELL S. OTIS,
Major-General, United States Volunteers.
CHARLES DENBY,
DEAN C. WORCESTER.

JOHN R. MCARTHUR,
Secretary of Commission.
MANILA, April 4, 1899.

APPENDIX 12.

TREATY OF PEACE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE KINGDOM OF SPAIN.

Signed at Paris, December 10, 1898.

Ratification advised by the Senate, February 6, 1899.

Ratified by the President, February 6, 1899.

Ratified by Her Majesty the Queen Regent of Spain, March 19, 1899.

Ratifications exchanged at Washington, April 11, 1899.

Proclaimed, Washington, April 11, 1899.

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas, a Treaty of Peace between the United States of America and Her Majesty the Queen Regent of Spain, in the name of her August Son, Don Alfonso XIII, was concluded and signed by their respective plenipotentiaries at Paris on the tenth day of December, 1898, the original of which Convention being in the English and Spanish languages, is word for word as follows:

The United States of America and Her Majesty the Queen Regent of Spain, in the name of Her August Son Don Alfonso XIII, desiring to end the state of war now existing between the two countries, have for that purpose appointed as plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States,
William R. Day, Cushman K. Davis, William P. Frye, George Gray, and Whitelaw Reid, citizens of the United States;
And Her Majesty the Queen Regent of Spain,
Don Eugenio Montero Rios, President of the Senate,
Don Buenaventura de Abarzuza, Senator of the Kingdom and ex-Minister of the Crown,
Don José de Garnica, Deputy to the Cortes and Associate Justice of the Supreme Court;

Don Wenceslao Ramirez de Villa-Urrutia, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Brussels, and
Don Rafael Cerero, General of Division;

Who, having assembled in Paris, and having exchanged their full powers, which were found to be in due and proper form, have, after discussion of the matters before them, agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I.

Spain relinquishes all claim of sovereignty over and title to Cuba.

And as the island is, upon its evacuation by Spain, to be occupied by the United States, the United States will, so long as such occupation shall last, assume and discharge the obligations that may under international law result from the fact of its occupation, for the protection of life and property.

ARTICLE II.

Spain cedes to the United States the island of Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies, and the island of Guam in the Marianas or Ladrões.

ARTICLE III.

Spain cedes to the United States the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands, and comprehending the islands lying within the following line:

A line running from west to east along or near the twentieth parallel of north latitude, and through the middle of the navigable channel of Bachi, from the one hundred and eighteenth (18th) to the one hundred and twenty-seventh (27th) degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich, thence along the one hundred and twenty-seventh (27th) degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich to the parallel of four degrees and forty-five minutes (4° 45') north latitude, thence along the parallel of four degrees and forty-five minutes (4° 45') north latitude to its intersection with the meridian of longitude one hundred and nineteen degrees and thirty-five minutes (119° 35') east of Greenwich, thence along the meridian of longitude one hundred and nineteen degrees and thirty-five minutes (119° 35') east of Greenwich to the parallel of latitude seven degrees and forty minutes (7° 40') north, thence along the parallel of latitude seven degrees and forty minutes (7° 40') north to its intersection with the one hundred and sixteenth (16th) degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich, thence by a direct line to the intersection of the tenth (10th) degree parallel of north latitude with the one hundred and eighteenth (18th) degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich, and thence along the one hundred and eighteenth (18th) degree meridian of longitude east of Greenwich to the point of beginning.

The United States will pay to Spain the sum of twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000) within three months after the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty.

ARTICLE IV.

The United States will, for the term of ten years from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty, admit Spanish ships and merchandise to the ports of the Philippine Islands on the same terms as ships and merchandise of the United States.

ARTICLE V.

The United States will, upon the signature of the present treaty, send back to Spain, at its own cost, the Spanish soldiers taken as prisoners of war on the capture of Manila by the American forces. The arms of the soldiers in question shall be restored to them.

Spain will, upon the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty, proceed to evacuate the Philippines, as well as the island of Guam, on terms similar to those agreed upon by the Commissioners appointed to arrange for the evacuation of Porto Rico and other islands in the West Indies, under the Protocol of August 12, 1898, which is to continue in force till its provisions are completely executed.

The time within which the evacuation of the Philippine Islands and Guam shall be completed shall be fixed by the two Governments. Stands of colors, uncapacitated war vessels, small arms, guns of all calibres, with their carriages and accessories, powder, ammunition, livestock, and materials and supplies of all kinds, belonging to the land and naval forces of Spain in the Philippines and Guam, remain the property of Spain. Pieces of heavy ordnance, exclusive of field artillery, in the fortifications and coast defences, shall remain in their emplacements for the term of six months, to be reckoned from the exchange of

ratifications of the treaty; and the United States may, in the mean time, purchase such material from Spain, if a satisfactory agreement between the two Governments on the subject shall be reached.

ARTICLE VI.

Spain will, upon the signature of the present treaty, release all prisoners of war, and all persons detained or imprisoned for political offences, in connection with the insurrections in Cuba and the Philippines and the war with the United States. Reciprocally, the United States will release all persons made prisoners of war by the American forces, and will undertake to obtain the release of all Spanish prisoners in the hands of the insurgents in Cuba and the Philippines.

The Government of the United States will at its own cost return to Spain and the Government of Spain will at its own cost return to the United States, Cuba, Porto-Rico, and the Philippines, according to the situation of their respective homes, prisoners released or caused to be released by them, respectively, under this article.

ARTICLE VII.

The United States and Spain mutually relinquish all claims for indemnity, national and individual, of every kind, of either Government, or of its citizens or subjects, against the other Government, that may have arisen since the beginning of the late insurrection in Cuba and prior to the exchange of ratifications of the present treaty, including all claims for indemnity for the cost of the war.

The United States will adjudicate and settle the claims of its citizens against Spain relinquished in this article.

ARTICLE VIII.

In conformity with the provisions of Articles I, II, and III, of this treaty, Spain relinquishes in Cuba, and cedes in Porto Rico and other islands in the West Indies, in the island of Guam, and in the Philippine Archipelago, all the buildings, wharves, barracks, forts, structures, public highways and other immovable property which, in conformity with law, belong to the public domain, and as such belong to the Crown of Spain.

And it is hereby declared that the relinquishment or cession, as the case may be, to which the preceding paragraph refers, cannot in any respect impair the property or rights which by law belong to the peaceful possession of property of all kinds, of provinces, municipalities, public or private establishments, ecclesiastical or civil bodies, or any other associations having legal capacity to acquire and possess property in the aforesaid territories renounced or ceded, or of private individuals, of whatsoever nationality such individuals may be.

The aforesaid relinquishment or cession, as the case may be, includes all documents exclusively referring to the sovereignty relinquished or ceded that may exist in the archives of the Peninsula. Where any document in such archives only in part relates to said sovereignty, a copy of such part will be furnished whenever it shall be requested. Like rules shall be reciprocally observed in favor of Spain in respect of documents in the archives of the islands above referred to.

In the aforesaid relinquishment or cession, as the case may be, are also included such rights as the Crown of Spain and its authorities possess in respect of the official archives and records, executive as well as judicial, in the islands above referred to, which relate to said islands or the rights and property of their inhabitants. Such archives and records shall be carefully preserved, and private persons shall without distinction have the right to require, in accordance with law, authenticated copies of the contracts, wills and other instruments forming part of notarial protocols or files, or which may be contained in the executive or judicial archives, be the latter in Spain or in the islands aforesaid.

ARTICLE IX.

Spanish subjects, natives of the Peninsula, residing in the territory over which Spain by the present treaty relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty, may remain in such territory or may remove therefrom, retaining in either event all their rights of property, including the right to sell or dispose of such property or of its proceeds; and they shall also have the right to carry on their industry, commerce and professions, being subject in respect thereof to such laws as are applicable to other foreigners. In case they remain in the territory they may preserve their allegiance to the Crown of Spain by making, before a court of record, within a year from the date of the exchange of ratifications of this treaty, a declaration of their decision to preserve such allegiance; in default of which declaration they shall be held to have renounced it and to have adopted the nationality of the territory in which they may reside.

The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress.

ARTICLE X.

The inhabitants of the territories over which Spain relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty shall be secured in the free exercise of their religion.

ARTICLE XI.

The Spaniards residing in the territories over which Spain by this treaty cedes or relinquishes her sovereignty shall be subject in matters civil as well as criminal to the jurisdiction of the courts of the country wherein they reside, pursuant to the ordinary laws governing the same; and they shall have the right to appear before such courts, and to pursue the same course as citizens of the country to which the courts belong.

ARTICLE XII.

Judicial proceedings pending at the time of the exchange of ratifications of this treaty in the territories over which Spain relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty shall be determined according to the following rules:

1. Judgments rendered either in civil suits between private individuals, or in criminal matters, before the date mentioned, and with respect to which there is no recourse or right of review under the Spanish law, shall be deemed to be final, and shall be executed in due form by competent authority in the territory within which such judgments should be carried out.

2. Civil suits between private individuals which may on the date mentioned be undetermined shall be prosecuted to judgment before the court in which they may then be pending or in the court that may be substituted therefor.

3. Criminal actions pending on the date mentioned before the Supreme Court of Spain against citizens of the territory which by this treaty ceases to be Spanish shall continue under its jurisdiction until final judgment; but, such judgment having been rendered, the execution thereof shall be committed to the competent authority of the place in which the case arose.

ARTICLE XIII.

The rights of property secured by copyrights and patents acquired by Spaniards in the island of Cuba, and in Porto Rico, the Philippines and other ceded territories, at the time of the exchange of the ratifications of this treaty, shall continue to be respected. Spanish scientific, literary and artistic works, not subversive of public order in the territories in question, shall continue to be admitted free of duty into such territories, for the period of ten years, to be reckoned from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of this treaty.

ARTICLE XIV.

Spain shall have the power to establish consular officers in the ports and places of the territories, the sovereignty over which has been either relinquished or ceded by the present treaty.

ARTICLE XV.

The Government of each country will, for the term of ten years, accord to the merchant vessels of the other country the same treatment in respect of all port

charges, including entrance and clearance dues, light dues, and tonnage duties, as it accords to its own merchant vessels, not engaged in the coastwise trade.

This article may at any time be terminated on six months' notice given by either Government to the other.

ARTICLE XVI.

It is understood that any obligations assumed in this treaty by the United States with respect to Cuba are limited to the time of its occupancy thereof; but it will upon the termination of such occupancy, advise any Government established in the island to assume the same obligations.

ARTICLE XVII.

The present treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by Her Majesty the Queen Regent of Spain; and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington within six months from the date hereof, or earlier if possible.

In faith whereof, we, the respective plenipotentiaries, have signed this treaty and have hereunto affixed our seals.

Done in duplicate at Paris, the tenth day of December, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight.

(SEAL)
(SEAL)
(SEAL)
(SEAL)
(SEAL)
(SEAL)
(SEAL)
(SEAL)

WILLIAM R. DAY
CUSHMAN K. DAVIS
WM F FRYE
GEO. GRAY
WHITELAW REID
EUGENIO MONTERO RÍOS
B. DE ABARZUZA
J. DE GARNICA
W R DE VILLA URRUTIA
RAFAEL CERERO

And whereas the said convention has been duly ratified on both parts, and the ratifications of the two Governments were exchanged in the city of Washington on the 11th day of April, 1899:

Now, therefore, be it known that I, William McKinley, President of the United States of America, have caused the said convention to be made public, to the end that the same and every article and clause thereof may be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States and the citizens thereof.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 11th day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and twenty-third.

(SEAL.)

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

By the President:

JOHN HAY,
Secretary of State.

APPENDIX 13.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, Washington, July 1, 1899.

OTIS, Manila:

By direction of the Secretary of War the following is transmitted.

CORBIN.

OTIS, Manila:

The President desires to express in the most public manner his appreciation of the lofty patriotism shown by the volunteers and regulars of the Eighth Army Corps in performing willing service through severe campaigns and battles against the insurgents in Luzon, when under the terms of their enlistment they would have been entitled to discharge upon the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain.

This action on their part was noble and heroic. It will stand forth as an example of the self-sacrifice and public consecration which have ever characterized the American soldier.

In recognition thereof I shall recommend to Congress that a special medal of honor be given to the officers and soldiers of the Eighth Army Corps, who performed this great duty voluntarily and enthusiastically for their country.

(SEAL.)

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

APPENDIX 14.

An act for increasing the efficiency of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from and after the date of approval of this Act the Army of the United States shall consist of three major generals, six brigadier generals, ten regiments of cavalry, seven regiments of artillery, twenty-five regiments of infantry, an Adjutant General's Department, an Inspector General's Department, a Judge Advocate General's Department, a Quartermaster's Department, a Subsistence Department, a Medical Department, a Pay Department, a Corps of Engineers, an Ordnance Department, a Signal Corps, thirty chaplains, to be assigned to regiments or posts in the discretion of the Secretary of War, the officers of the Record and Pension Office, the officers and enlisted men of the Army on the retired list, the professors, corps of cadets, an army service detachment and band at the United States Military Academy, and such other officers and enlisted men as may hereinafter be provided for: *Provided,* That when a vacancy shall occur through death, retirement, or other separation from active service, in the office of storekeeper in the Quartermaster's Department and Ordnance Department, respectively, now provided for by law, said offices shall cease to exist.

SEC. 2. That each regiment of cavalry shall consist of one colonel; one lieutenant colonel; three majors; fourteen captains, two of whom shall be available for detail as adjutant and quartermaster; sixteen first lieutenants, of whom one shall be available for detail as commissary, and three for detail as squadron adjutants; twelve second lieutenants, two veterinarians, one sergeant major, one quartermaster sergeant, one commissary sergeant, who shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a regimental quartermaster sergeant of cavalry; three squadron sergeant majors, who shall be senior to and have the pay and allowances of first sergeants of cavalry; one band; and twelve troops organized into three squadrons of four troops each: *Provided,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed as abolishing the office of chaplain in each regiment of colored cavalry. Each cavalry band shall consist of one chief musician; one chief trumpeter; one principal musician; one drum major, who shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a first sergeant; four sergeants; eight corporals; one cook, and eleven privates. Each troop of cavalry shall consist of one captain; one first lieutenant; one second lieutenant; one first sergeant; one quartermaster sergeant, who shall have the pay and allowances of a sergeant; six sergeants, six corporals, two cooks, two farriers and blacksmiths, one saddler, one wagoner, two trumpeters, and forty-three privates. Of the veterinarians provided for in this Act, one shall have the pay and allowances of a second lieutenant of cavalry and one shall have the pay of seventy-five dollars per month and the allowances of a sergeant major: *Provided,* That the veterinarian appointed to the first grade shall not be so appointed until he shall have passed an examination, to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, as to his physical, moral, and professional qualifications: *Provided further,* That the veterinarians now in the service who do not pass such competitive examination shall be eligible to the positions of the second class under such rules as are now prescribed by the regulations. The regimental sergeant major and the

regimental quartermaster sergeant provided for in this section shall have the pay and allowances of ordnance sergeants.

SEC. 3. That each regiment of artillery shall consist of one colonel, one lieutenant colonel, three majors, sixteen captains, two of whom shall be available for detail as adjutant and quartermaster; sixteen first lieutenants, fourteen second lieutenants, one sergeant major, one quartermaster sergeant, one band, and fourteen batteries, of which two may be organized as field artillery.

Each artillery band shall consist of one chief musician, one chief trumpeter, one principal musician, one drum major, who shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a first sergeant; four sergeants, eight corporals, one cook, and eleven privates.

Each battery of heavy artillery shall consist of one captain, one first lieutenant, one second lieutenant, one first sergeant, one quartermaster sergeant, who shall have the pay and allowances of a sergeant; eight sergeants, twelve corporals, two musicians, two mechanics, who shall have the pay and allowances of sergeants of artillery; two cooks, and fifty-two privates.

Each battery of field artillery shall consist of one captain, two first lieutenants, one second lieutenant, one first sergeant, one stable sergeant, one quartermaster sergeant, six sergeants, twelve corporals, four artificers, two musicians, two cooks, and fifty-one privates.

In addition to the enlisted men specified there shall be one electrician sergeant to each post garrisoned by coast artillery having electrical appliances, who shall have the pay and allowances of an ordnance sergeant.

SEC. 4. That each regiment of infantry shall consist of one colonel; one lieutenant colonel; three majors; fourteen captains, two of whom shall be available for detail as adjutant and quartermaster; sixteen first lieutenants, of whom one shall be available for detail as commissary and three for detail as battalion adjutants; twelve second lieutenants; one sergeant major; one quartermaster sergeant; one commissary sergeant, who shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a regimental quartermaster sergeant of infantry; three battalion sergeant majors, who shall be senior to and have the pay and allowances of a first sergeant; one band, and twelve companies, organized into three battalions of four companies each: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as abolishing the office of chaplain in each regiment of colored infantry.

Each infantry band shall consist of one chief musician, one principal musician, one drum major, who shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a first sergeant, four sergeants, eight corporals, one cook, and twelve privates.

Each infantry company shall consist of one captain, one first lieutenant, one second lieutenant, one first sergeant, one quartermaster sergeant, who shall have the pay and allowances of a sergeant; four sergeants, six corporals, two cooks, two musicians, one artificer, and forty-eight privates: *Provided*, That the limits of age for original enlistments in the Army shall be eighteen and thirty-five years.

SEC. 5. That all vacancies created or caused by the provisions of this Act above the grade of second lieutenant in the line of the Army shall be filled by promotion according to seniority in the several arms, subject to the examinations now prescribed by law: *Provided*, That the additional second lieutenants now attached to each regiment of artillery shall be absorbed in the artillery or transferred to other arms where vacancies exist without loss of relative rank, leaving but one second lieutenant in each battery.

Vacancies in the grade of second lieutenant shall be filled as now provided by law, except that no person shall be appointed from civil life before he shall have reached the age of twenty-one years nor after he shall have reached the age of twenty-seven years, nor until he shall have passed a satisfactory examination as to his moral, physical, and educational qualifications.

SEC. 6. That the Adjutant General's and Inspector General's departments shall consist of the number of officers now in those departments, respectively: *Provided*, That vacancies in the grade of major occurring in either department shall hereafter be filled from captains in the line of the Army: *And provided further*, That all such captains who have evinced marked aptitude in the command of troops shall be reported by their regimental commanders to the War Department and shall be entitled to compete for any such vacancy under such system of examination as the President shall prescribe.

SEC. 7. That the Judge Advocate General's Department, Quartermaster's Department, Subsistence Department, Medical Department, Pay Department, Corps of Engineers, Ordnance Department, and Signal Corps shall consist of the officers and enlisted men now provided by law: *Provided*, That the battalion of engineers, and the officers serving therewith, shall constitute a part of the line of the Army: *Provided further*, That in time of war retired officers of the Army may, in the discretion of the President, be employed on active duty, other than in the command of troops, and when so employed they shall receive the full pay and allowances of their grades: *And provided also*, That no person in civil life shall hereafter be appointed a judge advocate, paymaster, or chaplain until he shall have passed satisfactorily such examination as to his moral, mental, and physical qualifications as may be prescribed by the President; and no such person shall be appointed who is more than forty-four years of age: *Provided further*, That in case of the appointment of an officer who has served in a similar capacity during the war with Spain and has demonstrated his moral, mental, and physical qualifications for the position, then such examination shall not be required.

SEC. 8. That the Chief of the Record and Pension Office of the War Department shall hereafter have the rank, pay, and allowances of a brigadier-general, and there shall be an assistant chief of said office, who shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a major and who may be appointed from civil life: *Provided*, That whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of Chief of the Record and Pension Office subsequent to the passage of this Act said grade shall cease and determine, and thereafter the chief of said office shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a colonel.

SEC. 9. That the cooks authorized by this Act shall have the pay and allowances of sergeants of infantry.

SEC. 10. That the corps of cadets shall consist of one from each Congressional district, one from each Territory, one from the District of Columbia, and twenty from the United States at large. They shall be appointed by the President, and shall, with the exception of the twenty cadets appointed at large, be actual residents of the Congressional or Territorial districts, or of the District of Columbia, or of the States, respectively, from which they purport to be appointed.

SEC. 11. That so much of the acts approved July seventh, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight, as authorizes the assignment of certain officers of the Quartermaster's and Subsistence departments with increased rank, and the continuance in service of certain volunteer officers of those departments for a period of one year after the close of the present war, is repealed.

SEC. 12. That to meet the present exigencies of the military service the President is hereby authorized to maintain the Regular Army at a strength of not exceeding sixty-five thousand enlisted men, to be distributed amongst the several branches of the service, including the Signal Corps, according to the needs of each, and raise a force of not more than thirty-five thousand volunteers to be recruited as he may determine from the country at large, or from the localities where their services are needed, without restriction as to citizenship or educational qualifications, and to organize the same into not more than twenty-seven regiments organized as are infantry regiments of war strength in the Regular Army, and three regiments to be composed of men of special qualifications in horsemanship and marksmanship, to be organized as cavalry for service mounted or dismounted: *Provided*, That each regiment shall have one surgeon, with the rank of major; two assistant surgeons, one of whom shall have the rank of captain and one that of first lieutenant, and three hospital stewards: *Provided further*, That such increased regular and volunteer force shall continue in service only

during the necessity therefor, and not later than July first, nineteen hundred and one.

All enlistments for the volunteer force herein authorized shall be for the term of two years and four months, unless sooner discharged.

SEC. 13. That the President shall have power to continue in service or to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, brigadier generals of volunteers, who, including the brigadier generals of the Regular Army, shall not exceed one for every four thousand enlisted men actually in service, and major generals of volunteers, who, including the major generals of the Regular Army, shall not exceed one for every twelve thousand enlisted men: *Provided*, That Regular Army officers continued or appointed as general officers or as field or staff officers of volunteers, under the provisions of this Act shall not vacate their Regular Army commissions: *And provided further*, That no general officers appointed under the provisions of this section shall be continued in service as such beyond July first, nineteen hundred and one: *And provided also*, That any officer now in the Army, who was graduated at the head of his class at the United States Military Academy and who is not now in the Corps of Engineers, may be appointed to the Corps of Engineers with the same grade and date of commission that he would have if he had been appointed to the Corps of Engineers on graduation; but said commission shall not entitle an officer to any back pay or allowance.

SEC. 14. That the President is hereby authorized to continue in service, or to appoint by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, officers of the volunteer staff as follows:

Three assistant adjutant generals with the rank of lieutenant colonel, and six assistant adjutant generals with the rank of major.

Three inspectors general with the rank of lieutenant colonel, and six inspectors general with the rank of major.

Five judge advocates with the rank of major.

Thirty quartermasters with the rank of major, and forty assistant quartermasters with the rank of captain.

Six commissaries of subsistence with the rank of major, and twelve assistant commissaries of subsistence with the rank of captain.

Thirty-four surgeons with the rank of major.

Thirty additional paymasters with the rank of major.

Four signal officers with the rank of major, nine signal officers with the rank of captain, nine signal officers with the rank of first lieutenant, and nine signal officers with the rank of second lieutenant.

Provided, That for each Regular Army officer of a staff corps or department who may be retained in or appointed to a higher volunteer rank in said staff corps or department than that actually held by him in the regular establishment, there may be appointed one officer of volunteers of the lowest grade mentioned in this section for such staff corps or department, but no appointment shall be made which will increase the total number of officers, regular and volunteer, serving in any grade, above the number authorized by this Act: *And provided also*, That all the volunteer staff officers herein authorized to be appointed or retained in the service shall be honorably discharged on July first, nineteen hundred and one, or sooner if their services are no longer required: *And provided further*, That the officers herein authorized shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

SEC. 15. That the officers and enlisted men of the volunteer army shall be mustered out of the military service of the United States and discharged as provided in the Act of April twenty-second, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight: *Provided*, That enlisted men of volunteers who desire to remain in the military service of the United States or the temporary force authorized by this Act, may, if found qualified therefor, be transferred to and enlisted in such batteries, troops, or companies as may be below the maximum authorized strength, and when so transferred and enlisted shall be credited on their new enlistment with the periods of service rendered by them, respectively, as volunteers: *And provided further*, That the President is authorized to enlist temporarily in service for absolutely necessary purposes in the Philippine Islands volunteers, officers and men, individually or by organization, now in those islands and about to be discharged, provided their retention shall not extend beyond the time necessary to replace them by troops authorized to be maintained under the provisions of this Act and not beyond a period of six months: *Provided also*, That each and every provision of this act shall continue in force until July first, nineteen hundred and one; and on and after that date all the general, staff, and line officers appointed to the Army under this Act shall be discharged and the numbers restored in each grade to those existing at the passage of this Act, and the enlisted force of the line of the Army shall be reduced to the number as provided for by a law prior to April first, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight, exclusive of such additions as have been, or may be, made under this Act to the artillery, and except the cadets provided for by this Act, who may be appointed prior to July first, nineteen hundred and one: *And provided further*, That no officer who has been, or may be, promoted under existing law, or under the rules of seniority, shall be disturbed in his rank.

SEC. 16. That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to permit enlisted men of the United States Army to make allotments of their pay, under such regulations as he may prescribe, for the support of their families or relatives, for their own savings, or for other purposes, during such time as they may be absent on distant duty, or under other circumstances warranting such action.

SEC. 17. That no officer or private soldier shall be detailed to sell intoxicating drinks, as a bartender or otherwise, in any post exchange or canteen, nor shall any other person be required or allowed to sell such liquors in any encampment or fort or on any premises used for military purposes by the United States; and the Secretary of War is hereby directed to issue such general order as may be necessary to carry the provisions of this section into full force and effect.

SEC. 18. That all laws or parts of laws which conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Approved, March 2, 1899.

APPENDIX 15. DISTINGUISHED SERVICE.

The following-named officers and enlisted men, U. S. Army, and civilians, engaged in military operations, distinguished themselves by "especially meritorious acts or conduct in service" on the dates and at the places specified:

November, 1897.—Hospital Steward Ernst Grossjohann, Privates Harry Cook, James Smith, and James Q. Baber, Hospital Corps, U. S. Army; Jasper M. Lawrence and Garrett F. Hodnett, now out of service (then privates, Hospital Corps, U. S. Army), and the following-named patients in hospital: Privates John E. Simpson, Frederick Williams, Leslie S. Caldwell, Howard S. Potter, Battery H, First U. S. Artillery; Sergt. Robert A. Pahren, Battery B, Sixth U. S. Artillery, and Private John J. McKenzie, U. S. Hospital Corps (then privates, Battery H, First U. S. Artillery), and Private John F. Tobin, Battery M, Third U. S. Artillery (then private, Battery L, First U. S. Artillery): For meritorious conduct in voluntarily nursing yellow fever patients in hospital, Fort Barrancas, Fla., during the epidemic.

March 15, 1898.—Second Lieut. Walter S. Volkmar, Fourth U. S. Artillery (then sergeant, Signal Corps, U. S. Army): For bravery at the fire at Fort Sam Houston, Tex. (Certificate of merit.)

May, 1898.—First Lieut. Henry H. Whitney, Fourth U. S. Artillery (then captain and assistant adjutant-general, U. S. Volunteers): For extremely hazardous services, under disguise and at the imminent risk of his life, in reconnaissance

sance of the island of Porto Rico, in which he obtained most valuable information.

May 15, 1898.—Private Patrick O'Brien, Company H, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then corporal, Company E, First U. S. Infantry); Private Joseph Metzler, general service, U. S. Army (then lance corporal, Company E, First U. S. Infantry); Second-Class Private Michael J. Vickers, Ordnance Corps, U. S. Army (then private, Company E, First U. S. Infantry); and Richard C. Rush, now out of service (then first sergeant, Company E, First U. S. Infantry): For distinguished gallantry in repelling the attack of the enemy and for meritorious service at Point Arbolitas, Cuba.

May 15, 1898.—James F. J. Archibald, a volunteer aid-de-camp: For especially meritorious service in assisting in repelling an attack by the enemy on the guard from the steamer Gussie at Point Arbolitas, Cuba, in which act he was wounded.

June, 1898.—First Lieut. Matthew A. Batson, Fourth U. S. Cavalry (then second lieutenant, Ninth U. S. Cavalry), and First Lieut. (then second lieutenant) Guy H. B. Smith, Fourth U. S. Infantry: For hazardous services in reconnoitering and accurately locating the enemy's position at El Caney, Cuba.

June 2 to 5, 1898.—Lieut. Col. James Allen, Signal Corps, U. S. Army (then lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps, U. S. Volunteers), and Martin L. Hellings, out of service (then captain, Signal Corps, U. S. Volunteers): For persistent and successful efforts on an unarmed transport and within range of the Spanish batteries at the entrance of the harbor of Santiago, Cuba, in raising and severing two submarine cables used by the enemy.

June 13, 1898.—Private Edward G. Walby, Company C, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then artificer, Company A, Twenty-first U. S. Infantry): For meritorious conduct in preventing, at the risk of his own life, the swamping of a boat containing an officer and 7 enlisted men, and thus saving their lives; this 10 miles offshore in Tampa Bay, Fla.

June 24, 1898.—First Lieut. Thomas Ryan, Fortieth Infantry, U. S. V. (then first sergeant, Troop K, First U. S. Cavalry): For distinguished service in battle, Las Guasimas, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

June 24, 1898.—Corporal (then private) Elzie Jones and Farrier Sherman Harris, Troop I, Tenth U. S. Cavalry: For conspicuous coolness and gallantry under fire in the battle of Las Guasimas, Cuba.

June 24, 1898.—William F. Johnson, killed in action (then corporal, Troop B, Tenth U. S. Cavalry): For efficiency and coolness under fire in the battle of Las Guasimas, Cuba.

June 24, 1898.—John Boland, cook (then wagoner), Troop I, Tenth U. S. Cavalry: For conspicuous courage in exposing himself and killing, while under a heavy fire, a Spaniard who was standing on the stone intrenchments directing Spanish soldiers where to shoot, thus materially assisting in causing the cessation of the enemy's fire, in battle of Las Guasimas, Cuba.

June 24, and July 1 to 5, 1898.—Dr. John Guiteras, now out of service (then acting assistant surgeon, U. S. Army): For gallant and meritorious conduct in attending the sick and wounded on the field of battle at Las Guasimas and Santiago, Cuba.

June 24, 1898.—Private Thomas J. Isabell, Troop L, First U. S. Volunteer Cavalry: For distinguished service in battle of Las Guasimas, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

June 24, 1898.—Dr. Jose M. Delgado, acting assistant surgeon, U. S. Army: For distinguished service, being constantly on the firing line, exposing himself in the most conspicuous manner to the fire of the enemy, in the care of the wounded, in the battle of Las Guasimas, Cuba.

June 30, 1898.—Dr. Maximilian Lund, then acting assistant surgeon, U. S. Army: For especially meritorious conduct attending the sick and wounded under fire, during the reconnaissance at Tayabacoa, Cuba, and subsequently in making extraordinary efforts to secure their embarkation on the transports.

June 30, 1898.—Corpl. William H. Thompkins, Troop A (then private, Troop G); Fitz Lee, now out of service (then private, Troop M); Private Dennis Bell, Troop H, and George H. Wanton, now out of service (then private, Troop M, Tenth U. S. Cavalry): For distinguished gallantry at Tayabacoa, Cuba, where, after a force had succeeded in landing and had been compelled to withdraw to the boats, leaving a number of killed and wounded ashore, they voluntarily went ashore, in the face of the enemy, and aided in the rescue of their wounded comrades, who would otherwise have fallen into the hands of the enemy; this after several previous attempts had been frustrated. (Medals of honor.)

June, July, 1898.—Edward Ferrer, volunteer aid-de-camp to the commanding general Third Brigade, Second Division, Fifth Army Corps: For gallant conduct in the battle of El Caney, Cuba, July 1, 1898, and for most valuable service, voluntarily rendered without pay, during the campaign.

July 1, 1898.—First Lieut. Benjamin F. Hardaway, Seventeenth United States Infantry: For distinguished bravery in battle, El Caney, Cuba, in rescuing, with the voluntary aid of others, wounded from in front of the lines, under heavy fire of the enemy. (Medal of honor.)

July 1, 1898.—First Lieut. (then second lieutenant) Charles D. Roberts, Sergt. (then corporal) Ulysses G. Buzzard, Sergt. (then private) Bruno Wende, Artificer (then private) Thomas J. Graves, Private George Burg, and Oscar Brooklin, now out of service (then private), Company C, Seventeenth United States Infantry: For distinguished bravery in battle, El Caney, Cuba, in assisting in rescuing wounded from in front of the lines, under heavy fire of the enemy. (Medals of honor.)

July 1, 1898.—Second Lieut. Ethelbert L. D. Breckinridge, Seventh United States Infantry: For distinguished service in the presence of the enemy at the battle of Santiago, Cuba, while voluntarily serving as aid-de-camp.

July 1, 1898.—Second Lieut. Fred W. Bugbee, Fortieth Infantry, U. S. V. (then private, Troop A, First Volunteer Cavalry): For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Second Lieut. Ernest E. Haskell, Twenty-first United States Infantry (then acting second lieutenant, First U. S. Volunteer Cavalry): For especially meritorious and conspicuous conduct in battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—First Lieut. Granville R. Fortesque, Twenty-sixth Infantry, U. S. V. (then corporal, Troop E, First Volunteer Cavalry): For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Post Chaplain Henry Swift, U. S. Army: For distinguished service at the battle of San Juan, Cuba, where he worked unceasingly, caring for the wounded, reading the burial service over the dead, and assisting in their burial.

July 1, 1898.—Post Chaplain Charles S. Walkley, U. S. Army: For gallant conduct in aiding the wounded at the battle of El Caney, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—First Lieut. George A. Densmore, Thirty-second Infantry, U. S. V. (then private, Company G, Fourth U. S. Infantry): For distinguished service in battle, El Caney, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Post Chaplain Edward H. Fitz Gerald, U. S. Army: For conspicuous bravery in administering to the wounded, while exposed to a very severe fire of the enemy, in the battle of El Caney, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Second Lieut. Frank T. McNarney, Thirty-sixth Infantry, U. S. V. (then sergeant, Company H, Tenth U. S. Infantry): For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Post Chaplain Halsey C. Gavitt, U. S. Army: For meritorious service during the battle of Santiago, Cuba, in caring for the sick and wounded.

July 1, 1898.—First Lieut. Peter McConn, Forty-eighth Infantry, U. S. V. (then first sergeant, Troop E, Tenth U. S. Cavalry): For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Second Lieut. John Oliver, Twenty-seventh Infantry, U. S. V. (then first sergeant, Troop F, Sixth U. S. Cavalry): For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Capt. Thomas R. Marshall, assistant surgeon, Forty-first Infantry, U. S. V. (then acting assistant surgeon, U. S. Army): For gallant and meritorious conduct during the battle of Santiago, Cuba, where, under fire, he cared for the sick and wounded.

July 1, 1898.—First Lieut. John S. E. Young, Thirty-seventh Infantry, U. S. V. (then sergeant-major, Twelfth U. S. Infantry): For faithful, zealous, and intelligent performance of duty at the battle of Santiago, and during the Cuban campaign.

July 1, 1898.—Private Andrew Haring, Hospital Corps, U. S. Army: For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Regimental Com. Sergt. Charles Karsten (then first sergeant, Troop D), and William Britton, died of wounds received in action (then quartermaster-sergeant, Troop G), First U. S. Cavalry: For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Charles B. Jackson (then private), John H. Waller (then wagoner), Troop A, David L. Hughes (then sergeant, Troop B), John D. Rhoades (then corporal, Troop D), Edward C. Waller, Jr. (then corporal, Troop E), Charles E. McKinley (then private, Troop E), Edward J. Albertson, John G. Winter, Herbert P. McGregor, and Ray V. Clark (then privates, Troop F), Louis Gevers, George Roland, and Winslow Clark (then privates, Troop G), Sherman M. Bell (then private, Troop K), and Frank R. McDonald (then trumpeter, Troop L), First U. S. Volunteer Cavalry: For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—George O. Ravenstein, now out of service (then corporal, Troop B); First Sergt. (then sergeant) Bartholomew Mulhern, Troop E; Private Henry W. Elliott, Troop A (then corporal, Troop H), and John Lundmark, now out of service (then corporal, Troop K), Third U. S. Cavalry: For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. Maj. Julius Moll, Sixth U. S. Cavalry, and Tilden Hughes, now out of service (then private, Troop G, Sixth U. S. Cavalry): For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. James Lee, Adam Moore, now out of service (then sergeant, Troop C), Sergt. (then corporal) James W. Henderson, Sergt. (then corporal) Corbin B. Finney, Corp. (then private) Elijah J. Taylor, Sergt. (then wagoner) Edward Strother, and Private Marshall Sheppard, Troop C, Ninth U. S. Cavalry: For gallantry in the charge on San Juan Hill, in the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. John Mason and Private Edward D. Nelson, Troop H, Ninth U. S. Cavalry: For gallantry in charging, at the head of the troops, up San Juan Hill in battle of Santiago, Cuba, in which act they were seriously wounded.

July 1, 1898.—John Jackson, deceased (then first sergeant, Troop C); Elisha Jackson, now out of service (then sergeant); Sergt. George W. Pumphrey (then corporal), and Privates Edward Davis and James Bates, Troop H, and George W. Goff, now out of service (then sergeant), Troop K, Ninth U. S. Cavalry. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Squadron Sergt. Maj. Horace W. Blivins (then sergeant, Troop G), Tenth U. S. Cavalry: For conspicuous bravery in the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—First Sergt. William H. Givens, Troop D, Tenth U. S. Cavalry: For exercising a steady and encouraging influence upon the men of his troop and conducting himself in a thoroughly efficient manner in the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—William H. Daniels, now out of service (then private, Troop F, Tenth U. S. Cavalry): For conspicuous bravery in the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—First Sergt. Adam Houston, Troop C; Sergt. James Elliott; Sergt. (then corporal) John Walker; Luchious Smith, now out of service (then private, Troop D); Q. M. Sergt. (then sergeant, Troop E) William Payne; Ozrow Gather, now out of service (then sergeant, Troop E); Sergt. John Graham; Private Benjamin Fasit, Company D, Twenty-fifth U. S. Infantry (then sergeant); and Private Thomas H. Herbert (then corporal, Troop E); Trumpeter Oscar N. Oden, Troop I, Tenth U. S. Cavalry: For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Herbert D. Keene, now out of service (then corporal, Battery A, Second U. S. Artillery): For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Nicholas Arnett and Charles T. Vaughan, now out of service (then privates), and Private Charles McP. Eggleston, Company A, Second U. S. Infantry: For especially meritorious service at the battle of Santiago, Cuba, in remaining on duty in the trenches after having been wounded and not retiring to have their wounds dressed until after the firing ceased.

July 1, 1898.—Hance Strother, now out of service (then private, Company F, Second U. S. Infantry); Q. M. Sergt. John T. Duffy, Company M, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then sergeant, Company F, Second U. S. Infantry); Sergt. John S. Buff, Company L, Second U. S. Infantry (then corporal, Company E, Second U. S. Infantry); and Sergt. (then private) John M. Mooney, Company E, Second U. S. Infantry: For gallantry at the battle of Santiago, Cuba, continuing on duty, after having been wounded, until after the firing ceased.

July 1, 1898.—Private William Dales, Company H, Fourteenth U. S. Infantry (then corporal, Company H, Second U. S. Infantry): For especially meritorious service at the battle of Santiago, Cuba, in remaining, after having been painfully wounded in the knee, on the firing line with his company until it was relieved.

July 1, 1898.—Private Paul F. H. Kesse, band, Fifth U. S. Artillery (then private, band); Sergt. Robert J. Marsh, Troop G, Seventh U. S. Cavalry (then musician), and Henry H. Tyler, now out of service (then private, Company A); Private Orion L. Clark, Company F, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then private, Company B); Corp. (then private) William H. Saunders, and Private (then corporal) August Bauman, Company H, Second U. S. Infantry (then Companies H and B, respectively, Second U. S. Infantry), and Artificer Charles L. Vierke, Company I, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then artificer, Company H, Second U. S. Infantry): For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Q. M. Sergt. John J. A. Clark and Private John C. Young, Company L, Third U. S. Infantry (then sergeant major); Musician Godfred Kampher, Company B, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then musician, Company D); and Willie R. Cuffman, now out of service (then private, Company G, Third U. S. Infantry): For distinguished service in battle, El Caney, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Joseph Hagan, now deceased (then private, Company B); Q. M. Sergt. James H. Pirie (then first sergeant, Company C); First Sergt. Henry C. Osborn; Guy Teter, now out of service (then private); Cook (then private) Frank M. Thompson, Company G; First Sergt. Herman Hecht, and Edwin E. Follett, now out of service (then private), Company H, Fourth U. S. Infantry: For distinguished service in battle, El Caney, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—First Sergt. Thomas Farrell, Company B, Sixth U. S. Infantry; First Sergt. Harold M. Hallman, Company A, Sixth U. S. Infantry; Regimental Q. M. Sergt. Joseph Bennett, Sixth U. S. Infantry (then first sergeant, Company E, Sixth U. S. Infantry); First Sergt. Alexander Wyley, Company D, Sixth U. S. Infantry; John Murray, deceased (then first sergeant, Company C, Sixth U. S. Infantry); and Com. Sergt. William J. Browne, U. S. A. (then first sergeant, Company H, Sixth U. S. Infantry): For bravery and efficiency in the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—James M. Irvin, now out of service (then sergeant, Company E, Sixth Infantry): For gallantry in remaining on the field after having been

severely wounded and until ordered to go to the hospital, at the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. (then first sergeant) Dick Carter, Company F, Sixth U. S. Infantry: For marked bravery and coolness under fire in the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—James M. Mullen, killed in action (then private, Company F, Sixth U. S. Infantry): For gallantry in the battle of Santiago, Cuba, his entire indifference to danger offering a most excellent example.

July 1, 1898.—Corpl. (then private) Henry Edwards and Private Joseph H. Bias, Company F, Sixth U. S. Infantry, and Corpl. Edward Fairchild, Company D, Eleventh U. S. Infantry (then private, Company F, Sixth U. S. Infantry): For conspicuous bravery in rushing forward in the front line, and by their example encouraging others, in the charges on the blockhouse at San Juan Hill, battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Corpl. (then private) Edward F. Moore, Company F, Sixth U. S. Infantry: For conspicuous gallantry in rushing forward in the front line, and by his example encouraging others, in the charges on the blockhouse on San Juan Hill, battle of Santiago, Cuba, and again in the second charge upon San Juan Hill, when he continued on duty, although he was wounded in the first charge.

July 1, 1898.—Private Granville W. Buckland, Company E, Sixth U. S. Infantry; Private Edward Harrison, Company B, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then private, Company E, Sixth U. S. Infantry); and William Taphorn, now out of service (then private, Company E, Sixth U. S. Infantry): For distinguished bravery and coolness under fire at the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Corpl. Holger C. Kieme, Company B, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then sergeant, Company F, Sixth U. S. Infantry); Charles P. Kilkary, now out of service (then private, Company F, Sixth U. S. Infantry); Corpl. (then private) William C. Lynch, Company F, Sixth U. S. Infantry; Q. M. Sergt. Charles Crisler, Company F, Sixth U. S. Infantry; George Koehler, now out of service (then artificer, Company F, Sixth U. S. Infantry); and William Young, now out of service (then private, Company F, Sixth U. S. Infantry): For marked bravery and coolness under fire at the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. (then corporal) Norman W. Ressler, Company D, Seventh U. S. Infantry: For distinguished bravery in battle, El Caney, Cuba, in rescuing wounded from in front of the lines, under heavy fire of the enemy. (Medal of honor.)

July 1, 1898.—Warren J. Shepherd, now out of service (then corporal, Company D, Seventh U. S. Infantry): For distinguished bravery in battle, El Caney, Cuba, in assisting in rescuing wounded from in front of the lines, under heavy fire of the enemy. (Medal of honor.)

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. Maj. Samuel W. Shaffer; Sergt. Michael Barrett, Company K, now Company A; William McFarlane, now out of service (then corporal); Corpl. (then private) Laxton McMurray; Corpl. Thomas O'Rourke, Company I (then private); and Private George Smith, Company H (then corporal), Company A; Private Robert M. Smith, Company M (then corporal, Company B); Thomas Priestly, deceased (then sergeant); and Frank P. McMurphy, now out of service (then corporal), Company D; Q. M. Sergt. George Selmiré (then sergeant, Company H), Seventh U. S. Infantry: For distinguished service in battle, El Caney, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—First Sergt. Frederick Stones, U. S. Army, retired (then first sergeant, Company C, Eighth U. S. Infantry): For distinguished service in battle, El Caney, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Private Howard F. Alexander, Company M, Ninth U. S. Infantry (then attached to Company C): For coolness and bravery at the assault of San Juan Hill, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Corpl. James F. O'Reilly, Company B, Eleventh U. S. Infantry (then corporal, Company B); Sergeant Solomon Balmer, U. S. Army, retired (then sergeant, Company C); and Morgan Gardner, now out of service (then sergeant, Company D), Ninth U. S. Infantry: For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Q. M. Sergt. Herman Roth and Com. Sergt. (then quartermaster sergeant) Frank McCaffrey, Tenth U. S. Infantry: For repeatedly carrying orders from the regimental to battalion commanders under a heavy fire at the battle of Santiago, Cuba, and for gallantry and coolness throughout the siege.

July 1, 1898.—First Sergt. John A. Wise, Company C, Tenth U. S. Infantry; Sergt. Maj. Benjamin F. Lewis, U. S. Army, retired (then first sergeant, Company F, Tenth U. S. Infantry); First Sergt. George R. Langan, Company B, Tenth U. S. Infantry; First Sergt. Samuel Jones, Company M, Tenth U. S. Infantry; First Sergt. Cortez J. Moss, Company A, Tenth U. S. Infantry; Com. Sergt. Theodore F. Derrick, U. S. Army (then first sergeant, Company H, Tenth U. S. Infantry): For gallantry in action at the battle of Santiago, Cuba, where they rendered valuable service in assisting their company officers to preserve good order and a strict fire discipline.

July 1, 1898.—Com. Sergt. John McCarthy, U. S. Army (then first sergeant, Company G, Tenth U. S. Infantry); Corporal Mosheim Feaster, Company H, Third U. S. Infantry (then sergeant, Company G, Tenth U. S. Infantry); Q. M. Sergt. John Lagan, Company M, Tenth U. S. Infantry (then sergeant, Company G, Tenth U. S. Infantry); Corpl. Jabe N. Griffing, Company G, Tenth U. S. Infantry (then private, Company G, Tenth U. S. Infantry); Sergt. Samuel Hart, Company G, Tenth U. S. Infantry (then private, Company G, Tenth U. S. Infantry); Sergt. Harry Weeks, Company G, Tenth U. S. Infantry (then private, Company G, Tenth U. S. Infantry); and Walter E. Reynolds, out of service (then private, Company G, Tenth U. S. Infantry): For gallantry in advancing beyond the general line in the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1-2, 1898.—Sergt. (then corporal) Joseph A. Ross and Private William H. Collins, Company E, Tenth U. S. Infantry; Elbert C. Plummer, out of service (then private); Sergt. (then private) Albert C. Venn, Company E, Tenth U. S. Infantry; and Private James Carter, unassigned (then Company E, Tenth U. S. Infantry): For advancing farther and remaining under fire longer than other members of the company on the 1st of July at the battle of Santiago, Cuba, and for remaining in the trenches and fearlessly exposing themselves to fire of the enemy, though almost overcome by the intense heat on the 2d of July.

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. (then private) Alfred Polond; Private James J. Nash; Andrew J. Cummins, out of service (then sergeant); Charles P. Cantrell, out of service (then private); and William Keller, out of service (then private), Company F, Tenth U. S. Infantry: For distinguished bravery in battle of Santiago, Cuba, in assisting in rescuing wounded from in front of the lines under heavy fire of the enemy. (Medals of honor.)

July 1, 1898.—Junior Parrish, now out of service (then sergeant, Company A); Corpl. Robert N. Moseley, Company H, Second U. S. Infantry (then private, Company B); and Corpl. Hans Villumsen, Ordnance Corps, U. S. Army (then sergeant, Company D), Tenth U. S. Infantry: For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Q. M. Sergt. Hamilton J. Carroll (then first sergeant, Company C); Daniel Arundell, now out of service (then first sergeant, Company D); Sergt. (then corporal) Edward Myers; Joseph E. Abele, now out of service (then private); Company E, and First Sergt. John B. Murphy, Company H, Twelfth U. S. Infantry: For distinguished service in battle, El Caney, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—John W. Blair, deceased (then quartermaster-sergeant, Twelfth U. S. Infantry): For faithful, zealous, and intelligent performance of duty in the battle of Santiago, Cuba, and during the Cuban campaign, during which he died of fever.

July 1, 1898.—Private James L. McMillin, and Corpl. (then private) James W. Smith, Company H, Twelfth U. S. Infantry: For voluntarily and, under the fire of the enemy, bravely cutting some 5 miles of wire entanglements, thus opening the way for the advance of the troops at the battle of El Caney, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. Alexander M. Quinn, Company A, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry: For distinguished bravery in battle, Santiago, Cuba, in rescuing wounded from in front of the lines under heavy fire of the enemy. (Medal of honor.)

July 1, 1898.—Corpl. (then private) Rupert L. Bishop, Company B, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry: For voluntarily bringing up provisions to the men, at the risk of being shot by the enemy's sharpshooters concealed along his route, in the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Musician Joseph G. Devine, Company B, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry: For gallantry in the battle of Santiago, Cuba, where, armed with only a revolver, he secured a rifle and belt, and again taking his place on the firing line, remained doing noticeably good service during the whole fight.

July 1, 1898.—First Sergt. Otto Sydow, Company C, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry: For gallantly taking command of a platoon in advance of the attack on San Juan Hill at the battle of Santiago, Cuba, until he was left unconscious on the field, and for hastening to rejoin the American forces after he recovered; also for untiring and unceasing energy and efficiency in looking after the welfare of the enlisted men of the company in the trenches and during the entire campaign of Santiago.

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. James Touhey, Company F, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry: For zeal and energy in the battle of Santiago, Cuba, in dressing the wounds of his comrades and removing them to a place of safety and then joining his company without delay, and doing his share of the outpost duty during the night.

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. (then corporal) Irving S. Grady and Sergt. (then corporal) Frank M. Laird, Company G, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry; Private Howard Brady, Company K, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then private, Company G, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry); Q. M. Sergt. (then private) Thomas G. Cinnamon, Company G, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry; Private Henry J. Thorp, Company G, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry; Private John H. Samuel, Company D, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then private, Company G, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry); Frank A. Perry, now out of service (then private, Company G, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry); Cook Michael McQuinn, Company L (then private, Company G, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry); and Second-class Private Richard Voigt, Ordnance Corps, U. S. Army (then artificer, Company G, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry): For fearlessness during the most trying part of the attack, and for the good firing their coolness enabled them to do, in the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. Montague D. Williams, Company M (then sergeant, Company G), Thirteenth U. S. Infantry; Private Louis Salender, general service, U. S. Army (then private, Company G, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry); Private Joseph Pettit, general service, U. S. Army (then private, Company G, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry); Musician John J. Davitt, Company A, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then musician, Company K (then Company G), Thirteenth U. S. Infantry); and Sergt. (then private) John Pierson, Company G, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry: For conspicuous gallantry in the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Corpl. William F. Green, Company G, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry; Corpl. (then private) Frederick Russ, Company G, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry; and James W. Blair, now out of service (then private, Company G, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry): For being noticeably cool during the most trying part of the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—First Sergt. Theodore Nagel, Q. M. Sergt. William Dillman, William F. Buckalew, now out of service (then sergeant); Sergt. (then private) John T. Davis, Corpl. (then private) Frederick M. Anthony, and Charles C. Steigerwald, now out of service (then corporal), Company A; Murtha Hennessey, deceased (then first sergeant), Sergt. William Marshall, Battery O, Fifth U. S. Artillery (then quartermaster sergeant); Jack Burk, now out of service (then sergeant); and Samuel C. Middleton, now out of service (then private), Company B; Q. M. Sergt. John A. Heller, Sergt. James J. Kelly, Company C; Corpl. Mathew Doyle, Company K, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then Company C, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry); Corpl. Jason Kretser, Company C; Corpl. John B. Bond, Company L (then private, Company C); Corpl. William C. Cook (then private), Company C; Corpl. John A. Leakins (then private), Company C; Private John Loftus, Company C; Private Charles O'Hanly, Company A, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then private, Company C); and Irvin E. Brock, now out of service (then private), Company C; Ord. Sergt. Michael J. Murphy, U. S. Army (then first sergeant), and Private Frank Janowski (then artificer), Company D; Corpl. John Fuerstenberg, Company C, Fifteenth U. S. Infantry (then first sergeant); and Artificer Samuel W. Hilyard, Company E; Sergt. Arthur R. Alexander (then private); and Cook Edward Kelly (then private), Company F; First Sergt. Albert Ott, Private James McCutcheon, Company D, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then private); and Private John Bremer, Company H, Third U. S. Infantry (then private); Fred L. Smith, now out of service (then sergeant); Newton J. Greene, died out of service (then sergeant); Corpl. Louis P. Seufert, general service; Corpl. Arthur Agnew (then private); First Sergt. Frederic Binckli (then private); Alfred C. Petty, now out of service (then private); and Private Paul Klick, Company H, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry: For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—John Thompson, now out of service (then corporal, Company H, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry): For conspicuous gallantry in the charge on San Juan Hill, where he was among the first to reach the enemy's works, and for especially meritorious conduct throughout the campaign.

July 1, 1898.—Harvey M. Hone, died of wound (then corporal); Homer W. Lyons, now out of service (then private), wounded in action; Frank L. Clark, now out of service (then private), wounded in action; John F. Jansen, now out of service (then sergeant); Bernard Braddick, now out of service (then private); Private Ellis F. Ledgerwood (then first sergeant); Marin Donker, now out of service (then corporal); Charles D. Hunt, sergeant, Company A, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry; and Sergt. Fred E. Wheaton, Company K, Fourteenth U. S. Infantry (then private, Company A, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry): For gallantry and meritorious conduct in the charge upon San Juan blockhouse, being among the first to gain the enemy's works at the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Holmes Harris, now out of service (then corporal, Company A, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry): For meritorious conduct in the charge upon San Juan blockhouse, being among the first to gain the enemy's works, and for conspicuous gallantry throughout the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Sebring C. McGill, now out of service (then corporal, Company B, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry): For gallantry in the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Private Thru A. Strand, Company B, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry: For gallantry, being in front in the charge and among those who first reached the enemy's trenches, and in the attack on the blockhouse on San Juan Hill, in the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Clifton M. Spears, now out of service (then private, Company B, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry): For conspicuous bravery in front of and far in advance of the line, and being among those who first reached the enemy's trenches in the attack on San Juan Hill, battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Charles McGillin, now out of service (then corporal, Company B, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry): For gallant conduct in the first line of the charge, continuing in pursuit of the enemy some distance beyond their trenches and blockhouse, and in front of line established for the night, at the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. (then corporal) John Hanavan; Corpl. Edward Berg, now

of Battery M, Third U. S. Artillery; Corpl. (then private) Robert Borchart; Daniel F. Meadows, deceased (then corporal); Emanuel Sammet, now out of service (then musician); William Morrow, now out of service (then private), and John D. Hess, now out of service (then private), all of Company C, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry: For conspicuous gallantry and loyalty to their company commanders in the charge on San Juan Hill, battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. (then musician) Henry F. Schroeder, Company L, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry, and Musician Leicester Doras, Company G, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then musician, Company C, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry): For being of the utmost assistance in securing the simultaneous advance of the line, by repeating the sound of the "forward," although each call of the trumpet was sure to attract heavy fire: this at the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Artificer (then private) Edward W. Stewart; Frank S. Boone, now out of service (then corporal), and John C. Goad, deceased (then private), Company E, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry: For conspicuous gallantry, being far in advance of the line near the crest of San Juan Hill, in the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Richard N. Davidson, now out of service (then sergeant, Company G, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry): For coolness and deliberation in the attack on San Juan Hill, battle of Santiago, Cuba, during the hottest fire from the enemy, and for valuable services in estimating at the critical period his distances, and instructing and advising the men about as to distances and objective.

July 1, 1898.—Regimental Com. Sergt. Alvah T. Kase, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry (then sergeant, Company H, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry): For meritorious conduct, being fearless and active in the proper discharge of his duties, while under heavy fire for the first time, at the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. (then private) John Allen, Corpl. (then private) Robert M. McCrory; Fred G. Schroeder, now out of service, and Otto A. Hasenfuss, now out of service (then private), Company H, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry: For gallantry, being among the first to ascend San Juan Hill, at the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. (then corporal) Patrick Shea, Corpl. (then private) Fred Moseley, Cook (then private) William Litzinger, Private (then corporal) William O'Brien, Corpl. (then private) John Rummel, Private Benjamin M. Brodie, all of Company H, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry, and Private John T. Smith, Hospital Corps, U. S. Army (then private Company H, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry): For gallantry, being among the first to reach the crest of the hill in the charge of San Juan Hill, in the battle of Santiago, Cuba, and being at all times during the Cuban campaign conspicuous for courage and attention to duty.

July 1, 1898.—Corpl. Ned M. Green, Company D, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then private, Company H, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry): For conspicuous coolness and courage, being among the first in the charge on San Juan Hill, in the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Q. M. Sergt. (then corporal) Frederick Harfes, Company H, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry: For conspicuous courage while under fire for the first time in the battle of Santiago, Cuba, being among the first to reach the crest of San Juan Hill, and for courage and attention to duty during the Cuban campaign.

July 1, 1898.—James A. Austin, now out of service (then private, Company A, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry): For being among the first to reach the crest of the hill in the charge on San Juan Blockhouse, in the battle of Santiago, Cuba, where he was wounded.

July 1, 1898.—Walter T. Noyes, deceased (then private, Company H, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry): For distinguished bravery in going forward under fire, as a scout, to find the position of a regiment in the front of his company, at the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Charles E. Morgan, now out of service (then corporal, Company H, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry): For conspicuous courage and attention to duty in the front line of the charge upon San Juan Hill, at the battle of Santiago, Cuba, going beyond the enemy's ditches and blockhouse and assisting in disarming a Spanish prisoner; also for bravery in pursuit of the enemy.

July 1, 1898.—Frederick J. Liesmann, now out of service (then corporal, Company B); First Sergt. Frank Stevens; Sergt. James Sloan (then private); Sergt. William Graff and William F. Gilooly, now out of service (then private, Company G); Corpl. John Dudley, Company D, Nineteenth U. S. Infantry (then sergeant, Company H, Sixteenth U. S. Infantry): For distinguished service in battle, Santiago de Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Ord. Sergt. John O'Rourke, U. S. Army (then first sergeant, Company C, Seventeenth U. S. Infantry): For distinguished service in battle, El Caney, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Com. Sergt. Julius Jensen, U. S. Army (then sergeant-major); Sergt. (then first sergeant) Henry S. Groff; Private John C. Barnard, Company I (then Company A); First Sergt. George T. Rollins; William E. Loomis, now out of service (then corporal), and Corpl. (then private) William W. Mulford, Company B; First Sergt. Michael Kelly, Company C; First Sergt. Edward T. Nichols, Company L (then first sergeant, Company D), and Private Wesley W. Smith, Company K (then private, Company D); First Sergt. Ormsby Wolf, Company E; Polybe Rosat, now out of service (then first sergeant, Company F); First Sergt. Joseph Kassehmer, Company G; Q. M. Sergt. Julius Schulz, Company G (then sergeant); Sergt. Edward Flynn (then quartermaster-sergeant), Company G, and First Sergt. George Merdinger, Company H, Twenty-first U. S. Infantry: For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Edwin G. Clarke, now out of service (then chief musician, Twenty-first U. S. Infantry): For gallantry in carrying orders under fire at the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. Philip Gallagher, Company B, Twenty-first U. S. Infantry: For gallantry in carrying the colors under fire, by the side of the lieutenant-colonel, in the advance on the blockhouse, at the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Q. M. Sergt. Charles Shearman, Company M (then musician, Company B), Twenty-first U. S. Infantry: For bravery and coolness, voluntarily and unhesitatingly carrying messages several times through severe fire in the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Xafer Mauz, now out of service, and Oscar Moody, deceased (then private, Company F, Twenty-first U. S. Infantry): For gallantry, in bringing up rations and water under fire.

July 1, 1898.—Thomas M. Doherty, general service (then corporal, Company H); Corpl. George H. Nee, Company H (then private, Company F); Artificer Thomas Kelly, Company K (then private, Company H); Corpl. John F. De Swan and Frank O. Fournia, now out of service (then private, Company H), and Pvt. Herman Pfisterer, Company C, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then musician, Company H), Twenty-first U. S. Infantry: For distinguished bravery in battle, Santiago, Cuba, in assisting in rescuing wounded from in front of the lines under heavy fire of the enemy. (Medals of honor.)

July 1, 1898.—Corpl. (then first sergeant) John J. Byrne, Company F, Twenty-second U. S. Infantry: For gallantry, commanding platoon, at the battle of El Caney, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Corpl. William Parnell, Company B, Seventh U. S. Infantry (then sergeant, Company F, Twenty-second U. S. Infantry): For gallantry in battle of El Caney, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Mechanic Cornelius Cullinan, Battery C, Fourth U. S. Artillery (then sergeant, Company F, Twenty-second U. S. Infantry): For gallantry in battle of El Caney, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Sergt. James Satchell, Company A; Corpl. (then private) Scott Crosby, Company A; Corpl. Loney Moore, Company L (then private, Company A); Sergt. (then corporal) Richard Williams, Company B; Com. Sergt. William Thornton (then corporal, Company G); Sergt. (then corporal) Abram Hagen; Sergt. (then corporal) Peter Jackson, and John T. Williams, now out of service (then

sergeant), Company G, Twenty-fourth U. S. Infantry: For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 1, 1898.—Seth E. Beers, now out of service (then corporal, Company G, Thirty-third Michigan Volunteers: For distinguished service in engagement at Auguadores, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Dr. Thomas Y. Aby, now out of service (then acting assistant surgeon, U. S. Army): For gallant conduct in attending to the wounded on the battlefield and the sick in the trenches, while himself ill from the fever and heat; this at the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 1, 1898.—Dr. Harry W. Danforth, deceased (then acting assistant surgeon, U. S. Army): For especially meritorious service rendered during battle of Santiago, Cuba, in caring for the sick and wounded. He was killed while at work at the dressing station at the "Bloody Ford," on the morning of July 2.

July 1, 1898.—Dr. Francisco E. Menocal, now out of service (then acting assistant surgeon, U. S. Army): For gallant and meritorious conduct during the battle of Santiago, Cuba, where, under fire, he cared for the sick and wounded.

July 1, 1898.—Ramon G. Mendoza (civilian): For distinguished service in the presence of the enemy at the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 2, 1898.—Second Lieut. Ira C. Welborn, Ninth U. S. Infantry: For distinguished bravery in battle, Santiago, Cuba, voluntarily leaving his shelter and rushing, under fire, to the aid of a private of his company who was wounded. (Medal of honor.)

July 2, 1898.—Capt. Charles H. Muir, Second U. S. Infantry: For distinguished bravery in voluntarily exposing himself, at the risk of his life, to a heavy fire from artillery and infantry of the enemy, in a successful attempt as a sharpshooter to silence a piece of Spanish artillery at the battle of Santiago, Cuba, and for rare judgment and scientific skill in making reconnoissances, selecting positions, obtaining ranges, directing sharpshooters, and himself doing effective shooting.

July 2, 1898.—First-Class Sergt. (then sergeant) John Kennedy, Sergt. (then first-class private) James Richards, and Private Harry M. Bunce, Troop A, Sixth U. S. Cavalry (then first-class private), U. S. Signal Corps: For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 2, 1898.—George O. Ravenstein, out of service (then corporal, Troop B, Third U. S. Cavalry, commanding the detachment); Saddler Frank Maresch, Troop E, Third U. S. Cavalry; Cornelius J. Donohue, now out of service (then private, Troop E, Third U. S. Cavalry); Private Jeremiah L. Hooley, Troop E, Third U. S. Cavalry, and Wesley C. Kollo, killed in action (then private, Troop E, Third U. S. Cavalry): For holding their position and firing some fifty rounds of ammunition each, some 200 yards in front, while throwing up an intrenchment between the American firing line and that of the enemy, and exposed to the fire of each, holding their ground until the enemy retreated.

July 2, 1898.—John O'Brien, now out of service (then sergeant, Light Battery F, Second U. S. Artillery), and William G. Underwood, now out of service (then corporal, Light Battery F, Second U. S. Artillery): For coolness and courage in serving their guns under fire at the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 2, 1898.—William R. Logan, deceased (then private, Light Battery F, Second U. S. Artillery): For persisting in staying by his gun till compelled by physical disability to withdraw; this at the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 2, 1898.—James H. Cooke, now out of service (then sergeant); Artificer (then sergeant) Martin J. Murphy, and Corp. (then musician) Otto Scheu, Company B, and Private Alfred G. Simpson, Company C, Third U. S. Infantry: For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 2, 1898.—John H. Worthington, now out of service (then sergeant, Company A, Seventh U. S. Infantry): For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

July 2, 1898.—Sergt. (then corporal) Oscar F. Winters, Company F, Ninth U. S. Infantry: For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

July 2, 1898.—Thomas Flynn, deceased (then private); Frank M. De Pew, jr., and Thomas Glenning (then private and now out of service), Company B, Twenty-first U. S. Infantry: For gallantry in remaining out in front of the trenches during the furious firing of July 2, at the battle of Santiago, Cuba.

July 2, 1898.—Sergt. Michael Heffron, Company A, and Private Daniel Shields, general service (then corporal, Company G, Twenty-first U. S. Infantry): For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 2, 1898.—A. C. Munoz, volunteer aid-de-camp and acting engineer officer on the staff of the commanding general First Division, Fifth Army Corps: For gallant conduct in battle of San Juan, Cuba, where he was wounded.

July 6, 1898.—Corpl. (then sergeant) Alois Weishaar, Company A, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry, and Private William Ryder, general service (then sergeant, Company G, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry): For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificates of merit.)

July 7, 1898.—Private (then corporal) Michael Grogan, Company B, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry: For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

July 10, 1898.—Capt. Charles W. Jefferson, Forty-ninth Infantry, U. S. V. (then first sergeant, Troop B, Ninth U. S. Cavalry): For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

July 10, 1898.—Private John O'Conner, Company K (then first sergeant, Company A), Second U. S. Infantry: For distinguished service in battle, Santiago, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

July 13, 1898.—Capt. Frank L. Graham, Twenty-seventh Infantry, U. S. V. (then captain, First District of Columbia Volunteer Infantry): For meritorious conduct in saving, at the risk of his own life, two soldiers from drowning in the San Juan River, near Santiago, Cuba.

July 17, 1898.—Q. M. Sergt. Richard Curtis, Company G, Twenty-fourth U. S. Infantry (then corporal, Company G, Twenty-fourth U. S. Volunteer Infantry): For voluntarily reporting for duty at the yellow-fever hospital, Cuba, for any services he might be required to perform.

July 23, 1898.—Capt. (then first lieutenant) John W. Heard, Third U. S. Cavalry: For distinguished gallantry in action at the mouth of the Manimani River, west of Bahia Honda, Cuba, after two men had been shot down by Spaniards while transmitting orders to the engine room on board the steamship *Wanderer*; the ship having been disabled, Lieutenant Heard took the position held by them and personally transmitted orders, remaining at his post until the ship was out of danger. (Medal of honor.)

July 23, 1898.—Sergt. John McBride, Troop A, Third U. S. Cavalry: For distinguished service in action at Manimani River, Cuba. (Certificate of merit.)

July 31, 1898.—Sergt. (then corporal) Philip Sauer, Battery H; Corpl. Henry Stockfleth, Battery O (then Battery H), and Loid Neal, now out of service (then musician, Battery H), Third U. S. Artillery: For distinguished service in an engagement near Manila, P. I. (Certificates of merit.)

July 31, 1898.—Q. M. Sergt. John F. Wentling, jr., Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry: For distinguished service in an engagement near Manila, P. I. (Certificate of merit.)

July 31, 1898.—Richard F. Stapleton, now out of service (then private, Company A, First California Volunteer Infantry): For voluntarily carrying messages under heavy fire from the trenches back to the reserve at Passy Crossroad, near Manila, P. I.

July, 1898.—First Lieut. Walter C. Short, Tenth Cavalry (then second lieutenant, Sixth Cavalry): For especially meritorious conduct in that, having been wounded in the assault on San Juan Hill, Cuba, July 1, 1898, and having been sent to the hospital at Key West, Fla., he, upon learning that his regiment had suffered severe losses since he left it, applied for and secured passage back to Santiago, and

within a few days rejoined his regiment and remained with it throughout the Santiago campaign.

July, 1898.—Maj. Frederick J. Combe, brigade surgeon, U. S. Volunteers (then acting assistant surgeon, U. S. Army): For especially meritorious service during the Santiago campaign, in establishing, with the aid of others, the division hospital at the extreme front, carrying a portion of the supplies for several miles on his back during drenching rains and in deep mud.

July, 1898.—Private Frank Martinez, band, Thirteenth U. S. Infantry: For voluntarily nursing yellow-fever patients in the yellow-fever camp near Siboney, Cuba, for five weeks, during which period, although often ill himself, his patience, kindness, and devotion to duty were remarkable.

July, 1898.—First Sergt. (then sergeant) Alexander Arnett, Company E, Twenty-fourth U. S. Infantry: For voluntarily nursing the fever-stricken officers of his regiment for weeks, under particularly trying conditions, in the most faithful and self-sacrificing manner in the Cuban campaign.

July, 1898.—Private Charles Edwards, Company I, Seventy-first New York Volunteer Infantry: For voluntarily rendering efficient and unremitting care to the sick and wounded in battle near Santiago, Cuba.

July, 1898.—Drs. Hamilton P. Jones and William W. Calhoun, acting assistant surgeons, U. S. Army: For especially meritorious service during the Santiago campaign, in establishing, with the aid of others, the division hospital at the extreme front, carry a large portion of the supplies for several miles on their backs during drenching rains and in deep mud.

July, 1898.—Dr. G. Goodfellow, civilian, and volunteer aid to Gen. William R. Shafter: For especially meritorious services, professional and military, during the campaign in Cuba.

July, 1898.—George F. Hawkins, civilian and volunteer aid to Gen. William R. Shafter: For especially meritorious service during the Cuban campaign.

July, 1898.—Leonard Wilson, clerk, Inspector-General's Office, War Department: For faithful and valuable services throughout the campaign at Major-General Wheeler's headquarters, and especially during the battles around Santiago, and also while secretary of the commission which met between the lines and negotiated the surrender of the enemy.

July and August, 1898.—Dr. Nicholas Senn, now out of service (then lieutenant-colonel and chief surgeon, U. S. Volunteers): For his surgical work during the Cuban campaign, and for making a scientific study into the causes of typhoid fever among the troops.

July 31 to August 13, 1898.—Harry A. Young, killed in action (then quartermaster-sergeant Battery A, Utah Light Artillery): For voluntarily spending every night, when there was firing, in attending the wounded; this near Manila, P. I., the battery having no medical officer.

August 2, 1898.—William H. Shearer, now out of service (then corporal): George H. Hudson, killed in action (then private), and Richard H. Ralph, deceased (then private), Battery B, Utah Light Artillery: For leaping on top of the trenches and, under heavy infantry fire, removing the debris so that a partially disabled gun could resume firing; this during attack near Manila, P. I.

August 2, 1898.—Corpl. Joseph S. Oviatt, Company A, and Private Lawrence B. Conner, Company E, First Nebraska Volunteer Infantry: For distinguished service in an engagement near Manila, P. I. (Certificates of merit.)

August 5, 1898.—Chaplain James C. Schindel, Fourth Ohio Volunteer Infantry (now out of service): For gallant and meritorious services in the action at Guayama, P. R., where, by his intelligence and bravery under fire, he did much to encourage the men.

August 5, 1898.—First-class Sergt. Ernest Dodier and Sergt. Marshall S. Greene, U. S. Volunteer Signal Corps: For distinguished service in an engagement near Manila, P. I. (Certificates of merit.)

August 5, 1898.—Private Patrick H. Sullivan, Company F, Twenty-third U. S. Infantry: For distinguished service in an engagement near Manila, P. I. (Certificate of merit.)

August 9, 1898.—First Sergt. Cecil B. West, Company E; Sergt. Henry L. Clotworthy, Company I, and Louis I. Bigelow, Company E, First Colorado Volunteer Infantry: For distinguished service in battle near Manila, P. I. (Certificates of merit.)

August 10, 1898.—Col. J. Franklin Bell, Thirty-sixth U. S. Volunteer Infantry (then major and engineer officer, U. S. Volunteers): For especially meritorious service in making a bold reconnaissance of the creek in front of Fort San Antonio de Abad, and ascertaining not only that it was fordable, but the exact width of the ford at the beach, and swimming in the bay to a point from which he could examine the Spanish line from the rear, thus facilitating the planning of the successful attack of August 13, 1898, on Manila, P. I.

August, 1898.—Post Chaplain William D. McKinnon, U. S. Army (then chaplain First California Volunteer Infantry): For gallantry in attempting to enter the Spanish lines at Manila, P. I., when he was driven back by the fire of the enemy, and on a second attempt, also under the enemy's fire, succeeded in entering said lines and securing an interview with the Spanish officials with view to the surrender of the city; also in continuing to aid a wounded soldier after he himself had been wounded.

August 10, 1898.—Lieut. Col. Lewis H. Strother, Thirty-second U. S. Volunteer Infantry (then major and engineer officer, U. S. Volunteers): For meritorious service in assisting in reconnaissance work and for conduct which involved great risk of life and was characterized by coolness, courage, and other soldierly qualities in action at Manila, P. I.

August 13, 1898.—First Lieut. William G. Haan, Third U. S. Artillery: For distinguished conduct in the attack on Manila, P. I.

August 13, 1898.—Second Lieut. Joseph W. Beacham, Jr., First U. S. Infantry (then sergeant, Astor Battery, U. S. Volunteers): For gallantry in action at the battle of Manila, P. I.

August 13, 1898.—Second Lieut. William B. Baker, Eighteenth U. S. Infantry (then sergeant, Astor Battery, U. S. Volunteers): For distinguished service in battle of Manila, P. I. (Certificate of merit.)

August 13, 1898.—First Sergt. (then sergeant) Byron K. Smith, Company C, Twenty-third U. S. Infantry, and George P. Clark and Bishop Turner, now out of service (then privates), Company C, Twenty-third U. S. Infantry: For preparing shelter, under a heavy fire of the enemy, for the men, and holding an exposed position to the close of the action, at Manila, P. I.

August 13, 1898.—Sergt. Harry L. Burdick, Astor Battery, U. S. Volunteers: For gallantry in action at the battle of Manila, P. I.

August 13, 1898.—Musician Max H. Miller, Company E, First California Volunteer Infantry: For arresting, single handed, about thirty armed Filipinos plundering a Spanish vessel loaded with Government property, and marching them to the headquarters of his battalion, where they were disarmed and confined, at Manila, P. I.

August 13, 1898.—Private James J. Watkins, Company D, First California Volunteer Infantry: For distinguished service in battle, Malate, P. I. (Certificate of merit.)

August 13, 1898.—Private Samuel Hickman, Company F, First Colorado Volunteer Infantry: For distinguished service in battle, Manila, P. I. (Certificate of merit.)

August 13, 1898.—Charley Phenix, deceased (then private, Company I, First Colorado Volunteer Infantry): For raising the American flag near Malate, at the battle of Manila, P. I., in which act he was seriously wounded.

August 13, 1898.—Capt. John N. Loye, Forty-fifth U. S. Volunteer Infantry (then battalion sergeant-major, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteer Infantry): For valuable services rendered at the battle of Manila, P. I., where he was the first

to respond to the order of the commanding general to construct defenses for the protection of the most exposed part of the line.

August 13, 1898.—Marcus E. Holmes, killed in action (then sergeant, Astor Battery, U. S. Volunteers): For distinguished service in battle of Manila, P. I. (Certificate of merit.)

August 13, 1898.—Maj. Frank H. Titus, surgeon, U. S. Volunteer Staff (then acting assistant surgeon, U. S. Army): For establishing a first-aid hospital in the village church, and for the manner in which he came to the front with a detachment of the Hospital Corps through a heavy indirect fire, and the efficient manner in which he rendered services to the wounded at the battle of Manila, P. I.

August 13, 1898.—F. D. Millet and G. L. Rathbone, civilians and volunteer aids to Brig. Gen. Francis V. Greene, U. S. Volunteers: For valuable services rendered in the trenches at the attack on Manila, P. I.

August 16, 1898.—Q. M. Sergt. Reginald B. Looker, Company H, First District of Columbia Volunteer Infantry: For meritorious conduct in saving, at the risk of his own life, a soldier from drowning in the Bay of Guanica, off Fort Capron, P. R.

August 21, 28, 1897.—First Sergt. Richard Wolfe, Company I, Sixth U. S. Volunteer Infantry: For meritorious conduct in saving, at the risk of his own life, August 21, 1898, a soldier from drowning in Chickamauga Creek, near Camp Thomas, Georgia; and August 28, 1898, for meritorious action in saving the lives of three inmates of a vehicle, by stopping a runaway horse, at Lytle, Ga.

August, 1898.—Col. Charles R. Greenleaf, assistant surgeon-general, U. S. Army: For most efficient and hazardous services in the medical department in Cuba and during the Porto Rican campaign, especially in the yellow-fever camps.

August, 1898.—Capt. Andrew S. Rowan, Nineteenth U. S. Infantry (then lieutenant-colonel, Sixth U. S. Volunteer Infantry): For distinguished service in Cuba preceding and following the campaign, securing most valuable information under perilous circumstances, and also for rendering most efficient and valuable services in Porto Rico.

August, 1898.—Lieut. Col. William R. Grove, Thirty-sixth U. S. Volunteer Infantry (then captain, First Colorado Volunteer Infantry): For meritorious conduct in being particularly active in reconnaissance work and fearless in penetrating beyond the American lines and close to those of the enemy; also assisting in making a careful examination of the ground between the American trenches and Fort San Antonio de Abad, previous to the attack of Manila, P. I.

August, 1898.—Second Lieut. Rice W. Means, Company E, First Colorado Volunteer Infantry: For conduct in the Manila campaign involving great risk of life, characterized by coolness and courage; also for being particularly active in reconnaissance work, and fearless in penetrating beyond the American lines and close to those of the enemy, and for assisting in a careful examination of the ground between the American trenches and Fort San Antonio de Abad.

September 1, 1898.—George W. Garnsey and John M. Claxton (then privates), and James C. McCarty (then trumpeter), Company B; Louis A. Sillito (then private), Company C, and William L. Irving (then private), Company D, Third U. S. Volunteer Infantry: For voluntarily nursing yellow-fever patients at Guantanamo, Cuba.

October 5, 1898.—Acting Hosp. Steward Oscar Burkard (then private), U. S. Hospital Corps: For distinguished bravery in action against hostile Indians at Leech Lake, Minn. (Medal of honor.)

October 14, 1898.—Corpl. Frank L. Owens and Private Edgar A. Taylor, Company M, First California Volunteer Infantry: For meritorious conduct in saving, at the risk of their own lives, a soldier from drowning in the Pasig River, Manila, Luzon, Philippine Islands.

November 2, 1898.—Thaddeus R. Hyatt, now out of service (then corporal, Company L, Nineteenth U. S. Infantry): For capturing two of the worst criminals in Porto Rico, near Guayama, P. R. (Certificate of merit.)

November 15, 1898.—Second Lieut. William B. Baker, Eighteenth U. S. Infantry (then private, Astor Battery, U. S. Volunteers): For meritorious action in saving (with the aid of others), at the risk of his own life, a Filipino from drowning in the Pasig River, Philippine Islands.

November 15, 1898.—Corpl. Frank J. Hutchinson, Astor Battery, U. S. Volunteers, and Private Harry E. Duffy, Company H, Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry: For meritorious action in saving (with the aid of another), at the risk of their own lives, a Filipino from drowning in the Pasig River, Philippine Islands.

November 16, 1898.—Robert Healy, civilian: For meritorious conduct in saving, at the risk of his own life, a Filipino from drowning in the Pasig River, near Manila, P. I.

November 26, 1898.—Sergt. Edmond Barry, Battery H, Second U. S. Artillery: For meritorious conduct in saving, at the risk of his own life, a soldier from drowning, in Long Island Sound, off New London, Conn.

February 13, 1899.—First Sergt. Irvin L. Hunsaker, Company H, Eighteenth U. S. Infantry: For distinguished gallantry in battle, Jaro, Panay, P. I. (Certificate of merit.)

February 21, 1899.—Corpl. James B. Patterson, Company K, First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry: For saving the life of a comrade by shooting an insurgent who was about to fire upon the same, on the banks of the La Pas River, Panay, P. I. (Certificate of merit.)

February 23, 1899.—Sergt. Leon H. Chick (then sergeant, Battery H), Battery O, Third U. S. Artillery: For risking his life in order to check a fire at Manila, P. I. (Certificate of merit.)

February 23, 1899.—Charles Ohmer, now out of service (then private, Company F, Nineteenth U. S. Infantry): For attacking and defeating robbers near Adjuntas, P. R. (Certificate of merit.)

March 3, 1899.—Forrest F. Farmer, now out of service (then private, Company C, Eighteenth U. S. Infantry): For coolness and courage on picket duty near Jaro, P. I. (Certificate of merit.)

May 20, 1899.—Charles J. Lavier (then corporal, Company H, Ninth U. S. Infantry), died of wounds received in action: For meritorious conduct in saving, at the risk of his own life, a soldier from drowning in the Rio Grande, near Candaba, Luzon, P. I.

May 23, 1899.—Capt. John E. Boyer, First Washington Volunteer Infantry: For meritorious conduct in saving, at the risk of his own life, a soldier from drowning in the Pasig River, at Pasig, Luzon, P. I.

June 14, 1899.—Private Harry Shields, Hospital Corps, U. S. Army: For distinguished conduct in the flood at Brackettville, Tex. (Certificate of merit.)

June 17, 1899.—Corp. Michael J. Sullivan, Battery N, Fifth U. S. Artillery (then corporal, Battery G, First U. S. Artillery), and Private Thomas W. Parks, Battery G, First U. S. Artillery: For meritorious conduct in saving, at the risk of their own lives, seven persons from drowning in the Gulf of Mexico, at Galveston, Tex.

June 20, 1899.—Second Lieut. Robert H. C. Kelton, First U. S. Artillery: First Sergt. Harald Rasmussen; Sergts. Charles L. Thierry and Archie H. Dubeau; Corp. Edgar Steele (now private, Battery L, Seventh U. S. Artillery); Privates Thomas E. Brodeser, John F. Napier, Patrick O'Day, John R. Stone, Birchard Wilson, and Leonard Clark, Battery H, First U. S. Artillery: For heroic and energetic efforts in extinguishing the fire in the ordnance storehouse and consequent explosion of the powder magazine, at Fort Pickens, Fla., in which efforts Lieutenant Kelton led his men in the hazardous work.

October 6, 1899.—Capt. Edward L. King, Eleventh U. S. Volunteer Cavalry (second lieutenant, Eighth U. S. Cavalry, and then serving with that regiment): For saving the life of an officer in disarming a hostile Filipino who was about to shoot that officer at Binacayani, P. I.

November 27, 1899.—Second Lieut. Edwin H. Martin, Fifth U. S. Artillery: For meritorious conduct in saving, at risk of his own life, a soldier from drowning in the New York harbor.

Reapportionment Bill.

SPEECH
OF

HON. HENRY C. SMITH,

OF MICHIGAN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, January 5, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 12740) making an apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Twelfth Census.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH said:

Mr. SPEAKER: There are three bills before the House for consideration—the one reported by the chairman of the Committee on the Twelfth Census, the one reported by the minority of that committee, and the one reported by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], also a member of the same committee.

The first two named are based upon the tables furnished by the Director of the Census, and do not differ essentially in the method used to apportion the Representatives among the several States.

The aim of the first is to keep the House at its present numerical size. The aim of the second is to increase the number of the Representatives in such a manner that the Representatives in none of the States shall be less than at the present time. The third proposes to reduce the number of Representatives in some of the States because of the fact that a large number of voters in these States have been deprived of the constitutional right to vote, in violation of section 2 of Article XIV of the Federal Constitution, which provides that:

Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

There is much force and justice in this proposition. It may have been a mistake in the beginning to have granted the right of suffrage to the colored men of the South in their condition, so lately freed from bondage. The people of the Southland claim that the colored man can not be trusted; that he belongs, by nature, to an inferior race, and can not become the equal of his white brother, and that for this reason he ought not be permitted to vote. Our brothers of the South are so firm in this belief that it is not disguised that by various methods, fair or foul, the rights of franchise of their late slaves have been abridged, and they have firmly determined that they will not have the black man to rule over them. At first, by the aid of force and intimidation, he was discouraged, to say the least—to put it mildly and politely—from using the ballot.

Now a more genteel way is found—a method that is sustained by the courts—a method of fixing qualifications which the colored voter can not meet and comply with. The conditions are such, and the fact is, that they do not vote. An inspection of the Congressional Directory will show this. Take the State of Georgia, one of the most advanced and progressive of the Southern States, where intelligence and patriotism are of a high order. In 1898 there were cast for all the candidates for Congress of all the political parties in the whole eleven districts only 71,709 votes.

In the Second district of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent, there were cast at the same election, for the candidates for Congress in that district, 41,816. Think of it! Nearly as many votes were cast in my district as were voted in seven districts of Georgia. There were cast in the First, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, and Tenth districts of Georgia only 42,438. In Michigan, one Congressman has nearly 42,000 votes. In Georgia, he has 3,000. Upon what theory of justice and fair play can this be justified? It is a mere farce. It is natural that man should desire to "wield the scepter of empire;" that he should vote. If he does not desire to vote, there is some reason for this condition. It is not shown or contended that his brother of the dark skin does not want to vote.

Now, for one, I think he should be given the full franchise, or no franchise whatever. It is idle to give him the letter of the law and not the spirit of it. It is the "spirit that maketh alive." He has been deceived and tampered with quite long enough. This continual agitation keeps alive sectional hatred in our country, where none should exist. Let it be settled once for all. If he is to be permitted to vote, let that permission be free and full. If he is not, let this, too, be determined, and be beyond doubt and beyond dispute.

I believe he can be trusted. When his master took up arms

against the North and went out to fight against the Union for what he understood to be his rights, and he left his lands, his property, his wife, his daughters, his all, in the keeping of this black man—his bondman—when he went away to fight against the liberty of this man; oh, wonderful trust! oh, faithful obedience! And when he returned, vanquished, yet proud, he found that this trust and confidence had not been betrayed. The colored man is intelligent. There has never been a tribe or a race in the world's history which has made the strides of progress he has made. Think of the hundreds of years of bondage in which he lived. Generation after generation born and lived without hope, without opportunity, and without ability to better or improve conditions. Now, in these few years he is a leader among men—a virtuous, intelligent, and progressive citizen. The white race under the same circumstances could scarcely have done better.

He is patriotic, too. Witness the courage and bravery of the Twenty-fourth United States Volunteers on San Juan Hill. There is nothing in history or in fiction more noble than the conduct of these patriotic colored men. They volunteered to cut the barbed wire that hindered the forward march of our soldiers to meet the Spanish arms. It was certain death to all who went. They cut the wire in the very rain of Spanish bullets, that the Stars and Stripes might march on—that our standard might be placed on foreign soil. No man of them came back alive. They sleep this day by the silent sea, but their spirits will march on and their brave deeds will be read in song and in story by all the generations yet to come.

Can it be that such men ought not to have the right to cast an honest vote "where no man shall make him afraid," and that unchallenged by conditions he can not meet and comply with. Conditions which would not be reasonable to men who represent generations of culture, refinement, and education would be most unreasonable to be imposed upon men lately emerged from a condition of bondage, and when these conditions are imposed deliberately, for the purpose of preventing the exercise of the franchise, they are obnoxious, intolerable, and find no warrant in our civilization. Even the courts may sustain them. There is a law the courts and all must respect—the absolute right of every man to equal advantage and opportunity.

The trouble is, as it seems to me, this proposition of the gentleman from Indiana either comes too late or is not the proper method of treatment of the subject. It seems not practicable now at this time to determine for what reason or cause or by what means voters were disfranchised. It seems not fair to determine, with no facts, but upon inferences, that voters were disfranchised by unconstitutional inhibitions, and that therefore representation should be cut off. To enact into law such a proposition would amount to this. It seems to me that the provisions of the Constitution are mandatory, and that if it should appear that a Representative is returned from a district where voters are under the constitution disfranchised, such Representative is not legally here, and should not be permitted to retain and hold his place.

The whole matter could be adjusted by an amendment to the Constitution and then the passage of a law by Congress making the qualifications of voters uniform throughout the Union, in the same manner as it is proposed to make the laws of marriage and divorce, the law concerning the protest of commercial paper, and such like laws uniform. With such a law the whole problem might be solved, and solved equitably and fairly. I have submitted a resolution for such an amendment. The only men who do not vote are the insane and the criminals. The man who can vote and will not is worse than any other. He is an enemy to his country and an undesirable citizen. There is a greater enemy to society, however—the man who deliberately and intentionally prevents another from performing this sacred duty, upon the proper performance of which depends the good future of our great Republic.

I will now discuss the so-called Hopkins bill. It is urged that the membership of the House must be cut down, or at least kept with the present number. That we should be satisfied with ourselves is quite natural, but the main reasons urged are that the Hall is too small to admit of a larger number, and that the House now has ceased to be a deliberative body, and that the members can not give proper attention to public affairs under consideration.

I desire to urge, in the first place, that the aim of our Constitution and the design of the framers thereof was that the House should be the representative body; that it should be for the people and near the people; that the constituency of the Congressman should know him and have opportunity to confer with him. He is required to live in the district he represents. This plan and aim of the Constitution and of the framers ought not to be thwarted for the want of a proper place in which Congress should transact the public business. Are we to confine ourselves to any particular hall or place? The body ought to be paramount, not the hall.

In most, if not all, of the other countries of the world the direct

representative of the people has a much smaller constituency than in our country, and yet a way is found to transact the public affairs. American genius and intelligence should not despair—a way will be found, even without copying the "Magnificent discomforts of royalty." If the House has, in fact, become unwieldy and has ceased to be a deliberative body, this should and can be remedied. In the first place, much confusion would be avoided if the desks were removed, which subserve no good or useful purpose. Members use them only for workbenches and storerooms for newspapers, which are read during the consideration of the gravest subjects. With the desks out, the space could be narrowed so that there would be no difficulty in hearing and understanding all of the proceedings.

If the listener could hear, there would then be full attention. When the listener can only half hear it can not be expected that there will be rapt attention. There is nothing more disagreeable, or that will tend more to disorder than just partly hearing. With the desks out and the space contracted, the remainder of the Hall could be used for work and business purposes, where pressing business could be done and conferences might be had, so that all who were within the Hall would have and could have no purpose there except to listen, and then quiet and orderly attention would obtain.

Then, again, what inducement is there for a member to listen to proceedings in which he can not take a part; which he can not without severe criticism oppose or even inquire into? He can not, under the rules, get time or opportunity for debate or even recognition to inquire or to make a motion or an objection without the consent of the chairman having the matter in charge or without the consent of the Speaker. The report of the committee is sacred, and can not be opposed, criticised, or even inquired into. The member must bow to the conclusions of the committee or be branded a kicker and a traitor. Under such conditions who, forsooth, would listen? Stifle not the individual member, and the proceedings of the House will have attention.

The House is governed by committees, and an independent opinion of an individual member is absolutely suppressed, or at least such is the design. From time to time men come here, liberty-loving men, full of courage, who rise above the rules, but their path is not strewn with roses. If the committee is to be supreme, of what use is the member who is not fortunate enough to be on the committee? These members are only expected to respond to the patriotic call for a quorum. What a noble occupation for the representatives of a free and independent and self-governing people, the representatives of a government "of the people, for the people, and by the people." The conditions here are the logical conclusions of the spirit of the times—consolidation and combination; all must bend and yield to organization. This is the menace of the age. The thinking, planning, reasonable man is lost, and he is lost and swallowed up here, as elsewhere. Hope that "riseth eternal ever" is lost here, or at least such is the design.

As has been said during this debate, the fault is with the House; the remedy is with the House. If the members would rise to the full measure of their manhood, rise to the old heroic heights, the evils would disappear.

The Senate, with few members, is proverbially slow—that branch of Congress, the tomb wherein sleeps, against the impatient protest of the people, legislation until the need for it is almost past; and yet that body is in session more hours than is the House. I need only call attention to the Dingley law, which passed the House, the members of which were fresh from the instructions of the people, in a very few days. But it lingered for weary weeks in the Senate, until the impatient people were almost ready to rise and protest against the Senate.

River and Harbor Bill.

SPEECH OF

HON. GEORGE EDMUND FOSS,
OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, January 14, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. FOSS said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I desire to call the attention of the committee briefly to the item on page 27, lines 12 to 24, which reads:

Improving harbor at Waukegan, Ill.: Continuing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Doc. No. 343, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, \$100,000: *Provided*, That a contract or contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be neces-

sary to complete the project recommended in said report, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$245,000, exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated—

and trace the growth of a harbor that is likely to become one of the important ports on Lake Michigan.

Its first great advocate and defender was Daniel Webster, who upon one occasion, in a speech in the Senate, painted in glowing colors its future. The first appropriation was made for this harbor in 1853, when Congress appropriated \$15,000 for "the improvement of the harbor breakwater at Waukegan."

The first plan adopted was a breakwater parallel to the shore in 20 feet of water. One crib 30 by 125 feet was placed in position, but was carried away by storm, and work was abandoned. This is known as the project of 1852. The object was to provide a harbor for vessels engaged in the lake commerce of the city of Waukegan, with an entrance channel and basin 13 feet deep below plane of reference of the coast chart of Lake Michigan, being 3.6 feet below high-water rates of 1838. This is substantiated by the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, page 2520, 1896.

So far as I have been able to learn, nothing was then done until 1872 by the Federal Government.

In 1872 an examination and report were authorized in the river and harbor bill of that year, but no action was taken upon this.

In 1880 Congress made an appropriation of \$15,000 toward carrying out a certain project which is known in the Chief of Engineer's Reports as the project of 1880. This project of 1880 was:

To inclose a portion of Lake Michigan by projecting piers from the shore. North pier to begin at a point 2,370 feet north of the bridge pier, extend easterly into the lake 300 feet, then south 1,650 feet, thence southeast 142 feet, thence east 300 feet. South pier to begin 240 feet north of the bridge pier and extend easterly into the lake 900 feet. Area between piers and shore to be dredged to not less than 13 feet and shore line revetted. About 630 feet of the north pier was built under this project. A strip of land about 100 feet wide and 2,294 feet long was transferred to the United States by the city of Waukegan for harbor purposes August 24, 1880.

In 1881 Congress appropriated \$15,000 for continuance of the 1880 project, but in 1882 the provision of two years previous was modified—

by locating the south pier about 850 feet south of the shore end of the north pier and extending the north pier easterly from its outer end as it stood at that time. Since this diminished very considerably the area of the harbor, additional room was to be obtained by dredging an interior basin in the low ground between the shore and bluff connected by a narrow channel with the exterior basin. (Report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, Part IV, 1896, p. 2520.)

In every river and harbor bill appropriations to continue work upon the Waukegan Harbor along lines of project of 1880 as modified in 1882, and later in 1896, have been made as follows:

Act of—	
August 30, 1852, for breakwater (outer)	\$15,000
June 14, 1880	15,000
March 3, 1881	15,000
August 2, 1882	20,000
July 5, 1884	20,000
August 15, 1886	25,000
August 11, 1888	25,000
September 19, 1890	35,000
July 13, 1892	25,000
August 18, 1894	20,000
June 3, 1896	20,000
March 3, 1899	5,500

Total appropriations for harbor

Appropriation for outer breakwater (1852)

Total for present harbor

(Appendix L L—Report of Captain Warren. Report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, p. 3811, part 5.)

This statement shows \$220,500 appropriated for the present harbor to March 3, 1899.

In 1896 report (pp. 2519, 2520) the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, states:

The modifications of original projects of 1880 and 1882, as approved July 28, 1896, are as follows: The north and south arm of the north pier to be connected by a revetment with the American Mortar Company's revetment; the entrance to the harbor to be dredged to a depth of 13 feet below the plane of reference of the coast charts of Lake Michigan, viz, 3.05 feet below high water of 1838, with a width of 200 feet, and the harbor itself to be dredged to the same depth, and with a width of 300 feet, beginning at the northern boundary line of the Government land; and the new shore line in the harbor to be riprapped with heavy blocks of stone for a length of about 400 feet, beginning at the south pier.

Both piers were completed to full length in 1895, and the dredging in 1897, and since then expenditures have been for repairs and maintenance.

This is stated in the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in 1900, and I beg to quote his language as to the present condition of the improvement, as follows:

Soundings taken in April, 1900, showed a channel between the piers 13 feet deep below datum, and with a least width of about 100 feet.

The city of Waukegan obtained permission and caused the dredging of a channel, situated midway between the harbor piers, 50 feet wide and 18 feet deep below datum, and in the basin the same depth and about 300 feet wide, which connects with a slip constructed by the Elgin, Joliet and Eastern

Railway Company for the Western Coal and Dock Company, of Chicago. The railway company also dredged their slip to a depth of 18 feet. This dredging was completed in May, 1899.

Soundings taken in April, 1900, showed that the channel dredged by the city authorities had decreased in depth to about 16 feet, and had a minimum width of but 40 feet, and the Western Coal and Dock Company obtained permission to dredge it. This was done in April and May, 1900, resulting, they report it, in the removal of 33,650 cubic yards of material and a channel about 75 feet wide, with a depth of 18 feet.

With the exception of dredging done by the city of Waukegan and private parties, it is probable no material change in depth has occurred since soundings were taken. The actual depth June 30, 1900, was about 13 feet for a width of 140 feet, that had been obtained by the United States, within which for a least width of 75 feet a depth of 17 feet had been obtained by the city of Waukegan and other parties.

Thus we find that the project for a harbor at Waukegan in 1880, modified in 1882 and again in 1896, has been carried out by the Government.

Realizing the growing importance of Waukegan, with a constantly increasing commerce under adverse circumstances, I, as the Representative of the district in which the city of Waukegan is located, introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives in the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress, directing the Secretary of War to cause a preliminary examination and survey, embracing information concerning the commercial importance, present and prospective, and the advisability of improvement to be made at the Waukegan Harbor, with a view of obtaining a channel 300 feet wide and 20 feet deep. This resolution was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and, after a careful consideration, the committee acted favorably upon the subject-matter of the resolution and inserted the Waukegan item on page 40 of the river and harbor act approved March 3, 1899 (Public Document 189).

The Chief of Engineers of the Army complied with the law in this act, and submitted to Congress, through the Secretary of War, a report known as House Document 343, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session. After a careful investigation, the Chief of Engineers recommended a 20-foot channel, in accordance with the plans submitted by Captain Warren, of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, on January 5, 1900, as follows:

SURVEY OF WAUKEGAN HARBOR, ILLINOIS, WITH A VIEW TO OBTAINING A CHANNEL 300 FEET WIDE AND 20 FEET DEEP.

UNITED STATES ENGINEER OFFICE,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 5, 1900.

GENERAL: I have the honor to submit the following report of a survey and estimate of cost of improvement of Waukegan Harbor, with a view to obtaining a channel 300 feet wide and 20 feet deep, in accordance with the requirements of section 22, river and harbor act, approved March 3, 1899, together with a map of the survey.

The harbor of Waukegan, Ill., is situated on the western shore of Lake Michigan, about 35 miles north of Chicago and about 50 miles south of Milwaukee. The present harbor is entirely artificial, it not being located at the mouth of a river. The Waukegan River, which empties into Lake Michigan just south of the harbor, is a comparatively insignificant stream and of no importance or utility for harbor purposes. The only feature favorable for the construction of a harbor is the low ground between the shore line and the bluff and which is composed of sand and other material easily removed by dredging.

The earliest project for improvement of this harbor was adopted in 1852 and was for a breakwater parallel to the shore. One crib, 30 by 25 feet, was placed in position, but was carried away, and the work was then abandoned.

A definite plan for the construction for a harbor was adopted in 1880, modified in 1882 and again in 1896. The present project, as finally modified, provides for a channel 13 feet deep below the datum plane of harbor improvements, between parallel piers about 235 feet apart, together with a basin having the same depth and width of 300 feet, and extending north to the northerly boundary line of United States property. The piers were completed in 1895 and the dredging in channel and basin in 1897.

To obtain a channel 300 feet wide and 20 feet deep it will be necessary to build a new north pier parallel to the present pier, to extend the south pier, and to construct a breakwater, all to be located as shown on the accompanying map. The estimated cost of this work, together with the dredging, necessary repairs to present piers, etc., is \$305,000.

It is believed, however, that the main object sought, viz, to obtain a harbor having a depth of 20 feet, and that shall be accessible to and sufficiently commodious for the largest class of vessels engaged in the commerce of the Great Lakes, can be attained at a less cost by the adoption of the following plan:

The north pier to be extended 1,000 feet and the south pier 1,400 feet, by timber cribs, each 100 feet by 24 feet by 22½ feet, placed on pile foundation, filled with stone, and rippedraped.

A breakwater 600 feet long to be built, the proposed location of which is shown on accompanying map, the breakwater to consist of six cribs, each 100 feet by 30 feet by 25½ feet, on a pile foundation, filled and rippedraped with stone.

The outer end of the south pier and the southerly end of the breakwater to be protected by suitable bulkheads.

All that portion of the present north pier along the east side of the basin and as far out as the angle, a total distance of about 95 feet, to be removed, and a pile dock to be built on the line shown on map.

Rebuilding about 1,000 feet of the inner and older portion of the south pier above the water surface, making necessary repairs to the remaining portions of both piers, and refilling them with stone, where necessary.

Dredging in the harbor and basin to a depth of 20 feet below datum.

The proposed general plan of harbor entrance is similar to the plans adopted for Racine and Kenosha harbors, at both of which a project for a channel 21 feet deep is now in course of completion. It is believed that by extending the piers and locating the breakwater as proposed and as indicated on the map, disturbances in the basin by reason of storms from either northeasterly or southeasterly quarters will be prevented, and that safe entrance to the harbor can be had at all times. Experience indicates that whenever harbors in this district are deepened to 20 or 21 feet storms from a northeasterly direction produce serious disturbances not only in the harbor entrance, but for a considerable distance beyond, causing much dock front that should be available at all times to be useless during a gale from that quarter. Whenever in other projects for deepening and enlarging the har-

bors along the western shore of Lake Michigan a breakwater has not been included in the original project for such enlargement, it has been found necessary to subsequently modify the project to the extent of providing for a breakwater. It is therefore considered best to include the construction of the breakwater in the original project for the 20-foot channel.

Many complaints having been made of the difficulty of turning large vessels from the entrance channel into the basin, it is proposed to increase the area of the basin by dredging the triangular portion lying between the present north pier and the line of the proposed dock to a depth of 20 feet. The greater part of that portion of the north pier to be removed is in a decayed and dilapidated condition, and would require immediate removal above the water surface. It is believed that the pile dock can be built at a cost no greater, and possibly less, than the cost of renewing the pier. The additional cost of enlarging the basin would therefore be the cost of dredging, and which is estimated at \$17,000.

The estimated cost of the improvement is as follows:

Extending north pier 1,000 feet and south pier 1,400 feet by cribs 100 feet by 24 feet by 22½ feet on pile foundation, 2,400 linear feet, at \$70.	\$168,000
Breakwater, 6 cribs, each 100 feet by 30 feet by 25½ feet on pile foundation, 600 linear feet, at \$105.	63,000
Bulkheads for protecting outer end of south pier and southerly end of breakwater.	1,000
770 linear feet pile dock, at \$12.	9,240
Removing portion of north pier, 95 feet pile pier, at \$5.	4,675
Rebuilding 1,000 linear feet superstructure of south pier, at \$10.	10,000
Repairing portions of present piers.	2,000
334 cords stone for refilling piers, at \$6.	2,000
Dredging 332,000 cubic yards, at 15 cents.	54,300
Contingencies, superintendence, inspection, etc.	30,785
Total.	345,000

This estimate is based on present prices for material and labor, as determined by the latest bids received for doing similar work. The price of dredging is placed at 15 cents, to cover the cost of dredging hardpan, a certain percentage of which will probably be encountered.

It is therefore estimated that by maintaining the present width of entrance of 235 feet the main purpose of the proposed improvement can be secured at a saving of \$50,000.

It is believed that the present width of 235 feet is and will be sufficient for the requirements of commerce, and that the benefits to be derived from increasing the width 65 feet would not be worth the additional \$50,000.

With the exception of Menominee Harbor, none of the harbors in this district have so great a width of entrance as 300 feet. The widths of entrance to the most important harbors in this district are as follows:

Kenosha, 250 feet; Racine, 250 feet; Milwaukee, 234 feet, and least width between piers of 200 feet; Sheboygan, 275 feet; Manitowoc, 250 feet.

While the width of entrance to Waukegan Harbor is less than any of the foregoing, it is nevertheless believed it is sufficient, protected as the entrance will be by a breakwater.

It is therefore recommended that the present width of entrance be not increased, and that the extension to the piers and location of the breakwater be as shown by full red lines on the accompanying map.

Since the completion of the 13-foot channel by the United States extensive improvements have been made to the harbor by the city of Waukegan and by the Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway Company.

The entrance channel, basin, and adjacent slip have been dredged by the city of Waukegan and by the Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway Company, so as to afford a narrow but navigable channel having a depth of 17 feet below datum, thus making the harbor accessible to vessels engaged in the coal-carrying trade, the projected depth of 13 feet maintained by the United States being entirely inadequate for the requirements of the growing commerce of this port.

In accordance with the terms of a lease from the Secretary of War to the city of Waukegan, dated September 4, 1897, and granting to the city of Waukegan the use of a portion of the Government land, a description of which is given in Annual Report of Chief of Engineers for 1897, page 270, the city of Waukegan has built a pile dock along the westerly harbor line extending southerly for a distance of about 500 feet. The Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway Company have constructed the slip shown on the accompanying map, and it is understood to be the intention of the company to construct another slip similar to the present one in the near future.

The Western Coal and Dock Company, of Chicago, Ill., have obtained the dock privileges fronting on the south side of Slip No. 1 and have erected extensive coal sheds adjacent thereto, equipped with modern appliances for the rapid handling of coal.

It is understood that the Peavy Elevator Company, who now have large elevators at South Chicago, have obtained the dock privileges pertaining to Slip No. 2, the slip yet to be constructed.

Waukegan is provided with railroad facilities leading north and south and is the northern terminus of the Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway, commonly known as the "Chicago Outer Belt Line," and which makes direct connection with every railway entering Chicago.

It is believed that if the channel depth be increased to 20 feet, as proposed, it would greatly increase the commerce of the port and be of general benefit to a large section of country. It would also relieve the congested condition of Chicago Harbor to a considerable extent, in a similar manner to South Chicago Harbor.

The harbor is considered worthy of the proposed improvement by the United States.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. G. WARREN,
Captain, Corps of Engineers.

(Vol. 5, Appendix L L, p. 3773, Report Chief of Engineers, U. S. A., 1900.)

I beg to make this report a part of my remarks.

On May 23, 1900, I had the honor to appear before the River and Harbor Committee and urged them to carefully consider the importance of the Waukegan Harbor, as follows:

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN OF THE COMMITTEE: I desire simply and briefly to call your attention to the harbor of Waukegan. While of course I am interested in all harbor facilities in the city of Chicago in view of the fact that the larger portion of my district is in that city, yet I do not appear here at this time for the harbor there, but more particularly for the harbor at Waukegan. This is the only harbor situated and located in my district.

Waukegan is a city which, according to the census of 1890, had a population of 6,000. I think the census of 1900 will show a population of 10,000—that is to say, during the last ten years it has nearly doubled, if not more, in population. In fact I do not know of any city in northern Illinois which has shown such progress and growth during the last ten years as Waukegan. It is about 35 miles from Chicago and about 50 miles south of Milwaukee and within 6 or 7 miles of the Wisconsin State line.

The first improvement made by the Government at Waukegan on its

harbor was in 1852. In 1880 a plan was adopted for the construction of a harbor, and was afterwards modified in 1882 and again in 1896, which provides for a channel 13 feet deep and an entrance to the harbor of 235 feet. That plan has been completed, as I understand, so that Waukegan Harbor to-day has a depth of water of about 13 feet, although the main channel of the river, I may say, is much more than that by reason of the fact that the city has expended money there and has obtained a much deeper channel, and in some places, I think, it runs to 15, 17, or even 18 feet deep. Now, in the last river and harbor act, which was passed March 3, 1899, there was a provision for a preliminary examination of this harbor, with a view of obtaining a channel 300 feet wide and 20 feet deep, and under that provision the Chief of Engineers went to work and made a survey and estimate of cost, and he states here in this document, House Document 343, in reference to this matter, that—

"To obtain a channel 300 feet wide and 20 feet deep will necessitate the construction of a new north pier parallel to the present pier, the extension of the south pier, and the construction of a breakwater, all to be located as shown by broken red lines on the accompanying map, the estimated cost, including dredging, repairs to present pier, etc., being \$305,000."

The resolution I drew up myself, but I was not aware at that time what the actual entrance to the harbor was, so I put it in at 300 feet. As a matter of fact it is only 235 feet, and I think that would be all that is necessary, and if so, it would not be necessary to make a new entrance or change the piers in any way, shape, manner, or form. The Chief of Engineers also made an estimate, keeping the entrance at the present time of 235 feet, showing there would be a saving of \$50,000, making, then, the total estimate of cost for improving this harbor 20 feet and leaving its present entrance at 235 feet at \$345,000.

I may say in this connection that there are a great many important industries at Waukegan. There are several large manufacturing establishments, some of them employing as high as from 500 to 600 men, and it is a growing manufacturing city.

Captain Warren, of the Corps of Engineers, makes this recommendation at the end of this statement which I will file with you. Among other things, he says:

"The Western Coal and Dock Company, of Chicago, Ill., have obtained the dock privileges for running on the south side of Slip No. 1, and have erected extensive coal sheds adjacent thereto, equipped with modern appliances for the rapid handling of coal."

He also says:

"Waukegan is provided with railroad facilities leading north and south and is the northern terminus of the Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway, commonly known as the 'Chicago Outer Belt Line,' and which makes direct connection with every railroad in Chicago."

And he further states:

"It is believed that if the channel depth be increased to 20 feet, as proposed, it would greatly increase the commerce of the port and be of general benefit to a large section of country. It would also relieve the congested condition of Chicago Harbor to a considerable extent, in a similar manner to South Chicago Harbor. The harbor is considered worthy of the proposed improvement by the United States."

I trust the committee will give this careful consideration, and I would be very much pleased, if in their judgment they think it wise, that the Government should be committed to the work and the work placed upon the continuing contract plan.

It is a matter of great gratification to me, and I know it will be to the city of Waukegan and the surrounding country, that the committee has seen fit to insert in this bill a provision for improvements at Waukegan to the extent of \$345,000.

This will be sufficient, as stated by the Chief of Engineers, to give a channel of 20 feet, making a harbor at Waukegan of the same depth as the great harbors on the lakes, and thereby encouraging manufacturing plants to locate where they can obtain the benefits of cheap freights in an enterprising, growing, and healthy city.

There is not a more meritorious project in this bill than the improvement of the Waukegan Harbor. During last year 747 vessels cleared from that port—a marked increase, and it is believed that with the increased depth of the channel ships of large tonnage bearing more merchandise will come and go and increase the commerce of the port until in time Waukegan will become one of the important ports on the Great Lakes.

Certainly there is no harbor in the country that has a more brilliant future than Waukegan.

Everything that I said in my speech before the committee a year ago has been verified by time. At that time I stated that I believed the census of 1900 would show a population for Waukegan of about 10,000. I also stated that I did not know a place in northern Illinois that had shown in the last decade such progress and growth according to its population. That has been verified by the census; and not only has the city doubled in population, but Lake County, in which Waukegan is situated, shows the enormous increase of 42.3 per cent, standing second in the list of percentage of increase in Illinois, Cook being first.

The people of this city are energetic and alive to the commercial needs and demands of this port.

Time and time again the city has expended large sums of money in aiding the Government in improving this harbor. Land has been donated to the Federal Government, and in every possible way the people of this growing city have shown themselves willing to spend of their time and money in developing the commerce of this harbor. Their acts have not only benefited Waukegan, but the commercial interests of the country.

They are a patriotic people, and never in the history of a national crisis have they failed to give of their bone and sinew to maintain the integrity of our institutions and support the honor of the country and our flag. On the roll of the nation's honored dead during the civil war and the recent Spanish conflict will be found the names of its patriotic and noblest sons, and many of its citizens to-day are bearing the scars of the nation's true nobility.

Therefore from every standpoint and consideration the people of Waukegan are worthy of your favorable action, and I trust the provision of the bill recommended by the committee and the War Department as a proper object of Government aid will not meet with objection from any member of this House, but, on the contrary, will receive general approval and become the fixed law of the land.

River and Harbor Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. SPARKMAN,

OF FLORIDA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, January 14, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. SPARKMAN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not intend speaking on the pending measure at all, preferring to leave it to the House with the lucid statement and the able argument of the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors made in behalf of the bill; but certain criticisms have been indulged in by one or two gentlemen on this floor, some of which have been leveled at my own State, and lest my silence might be construed into an admission of the justice of these criticisms, I have changed my intention to remain silent and will ask the indulgence of the House while I discuss some of the provisions in the bill and reply to some of the claims made by those opposing the measure.

Not that we object to criticism. On the contrary, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors courts the most searching inquiry into every provision in this bill. The chairman has, indeed, thrown wide open the door for discussion, and out of the alembic of criticism may come justice if injustice or wrong has been done any section or State or any member on this floor; but I claim, Mr. Chairman, that no injustice, certainly no intentional injustice, has been done anyone.

Disappointments have occurred, to be sure. Members have not gotten as much out of this bill as they had wished, and the members of the committee are no exception to this rule. I dare say if a poll could be taken of the committee itself it would be ascertained that several pet schemes of some of them have not been taken care of. They have not received all that was hoped for by them for their States or districts. But, sir, in a bill carrying only \$60,000,000 this is impossible, if a distribution of that amount is to be made on the basis of commerce, present or prospective. The country is too large, the worthy projects are too numerous, the demands of commerce too great to hope that all can be fully taken care of in one such bill.

Now, I am glad there has been no criticism of this bill on the ground that it carries too much, for it is certainly not open to criticism on that score; on the contrary, if I were called upon to criticize the bill at all, I should do it on the ground that it carries too little instead of too much. Not that I complain of the size of the bill. It makes as large an appropriation as the committee thought the bill should carry, considering the necessities of other departments of the Government. But, sir, this is a great country; it is growing rapidly in every direction—in population, in wealth, in agriculture, in manufacturing, and in commerce. Cheap transportation, not only from the United States to foreign countries, but between the different parts of our own country, is the great desideratum.

The producer needs the lowest freight rates possible, whether he seeks a foreign or a home market, and is consequently interested beyond measure in the development of all the harbors and commerce-bearing streams of the country. When, therefore, we consider the importance of river and harbor work, the intimate relations it bears to the commercial and business growth of the country, we could certainly, it seems to me, justify a bill carrying an amount much larger than that appropriated by this bill; and we may expect to see such appropriations going on and increasing until the necessities of commerce are completely met. The people will demand it, and we could not resist those demands here if we would.

But, Mr. Chairman, one or two members have criticised this bill on account of the appropriations which go to the States represented by members on the committee, or perhaps it would be more correct to say that the committee has been thus criticised,

for no one has undertaken as yet to say that the appropriations have been unworthily bestowed. The cry is that the States represented on the committee have received too much as compared with those States not thus represented, and that especially the districts represented by members on the committee have been unduly favored. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] was especially severe on that line, and my own State came in for a share of his invective.

Now, I shall not undertake to reply at length to the insinuation that in the aggregate the States represented on the committee received too much, for that charge was shown to be inaccurate by my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ALEXANDER]. It was demonstrated by him that the 17 States represented on the committee, receiving only three-fourths of the \$60,000,000 appropriated and authorized, actually have more than 80 per cent of all the commerce of the country, and that if commerce alone is to be considered, then these 17 States are entitled to even more than they get in the bill. This is the way, at least, it presents itself when aggregates alone are considered. The same would no doubt be true if a like test were applied to the individual States.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is with regard to the criticisms of myself and of the State which I have the honor in part to represent on this floor that I intend to reply more particularly. If the gentleman will cast his eye over the map of the State of Florida, he will see a long peninsula extending from the lower edge of the State of Georgia way out into the southern seas, almost to Cuba and to the Bermudas, with a coast line of more than 1,400 miles on straight lines, but if he were to follow the sinuosities of the shore line he would travel more than 1,800 miles going from the Perdido River, on the west, around by the Tortugas to Fernandina.

On this coast line he would find 9 large deep-water harbors, 3 on the Atlantic and 6 on the Gulf of Mexico; all of them of national importance, but 3 of which, namely, Pensacola, Tampa, and Key West, have been classed among the 12 or 15 natural deep-water harbors of the country. Besides these there are many rivers and smaller harbors, all important to the commerce of the State, and incidentally to the country at large.

It is over and through these that the productions of that State can be carried to the seaboard or other distributing centers, where the surplus, which is great, is carried and distributed throughout the United States. Through these harbors comes and goes a large and rapidly increasing coastwise and foreign commerce, the estimated value of which is upward of \$60,000,000 per annum. Who, then, can say that Florida, with all these rivers and harbors and all this commerce, receives too much at the hands of the River and Harbor Committee?

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not all. The income which the Government derives from Florida entitles her to generous treatment at the hands of this body. From all sources—from the custom-houses, internal-revenue department, post-offices, etc.—for the year ending December 31 last Florida paid about \$2,000,000 into the Government till, and from my own town, the city of Tampa, which gets only \$150,000 in this bill, the Government received for the same period the magnificent sum of about \$1,500,000, or more than was paid into the National Treasury by the whole State of Washington combined for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900.

Florida receives in this bill, in cash and in authorizations, a little more than \$1,700,000, or about \$850,000 per annum, supposing that the cash and the amount authorized can all be spent during the next two years; so it will be seen that she does not get one-half of what she will pay into the National Treasury during the same period of time.

In that connection I wish to advert to another matter to which the gentleman alluded. He intimated, or at least I understood him as intimating, that I had favored my district at the expense of the other district of the State of Florida. If my friend will look at the figures, he will change his mind, for out of the seventeen hundred and odd thousand dollars given to Florida \$1,335,000, or about three-fourths, goes to the Second district, represented by my colleague, not counting \$20,000 appropriated, together with the sum of \$35,000 given by the Fifty-fifth Congress, for the building of a dredge to be used throughout the State.

Thus it will be seen that I have not only not favored my district, but have given to the Second district the lion's share of the appropriation, and that, too, whilst in the First district, which I have the honor to represent here, there are many more projects demanding and which should receive the attention of Congress than happen to be in the Second Congressional district, so ably represented by my colleague, Mr. DAVIS; and yet that district does not receive any more than its just dues, even if it could be claimed that it has received more in this bill.

Then, too, the gentleman stated, as one of the reasons for condemning the bill, or the members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, that one river, viz, the Anclote, in my district, could not be found on the latest edition of Rand & McNally's map. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the gentleman could not find

this river on the map which he happened to examine, but I am not in any way responsible for his failure so to do. I did not make the map. If I had, I can assure him the river would not have been overlooked, but would have been placed on the map, properly marked, named, and designated, for, in the language of the gentleman, "the river is there."

It rises in the lake region, on the border line between my own and an adjoining county, and flows thence in a westerly direction into the Gulf of Mexico, some thirty-five or forty miles north of the entrance to Tampa. It is also a commerce-bearing stream, of importance not only to the locality, but to the shipping interests for quite a distance up and down the coast and as far south as Key West. Just off the mouth of this river are some of the finest fishing and sponging grounds in the Gulf.

An immense traffic is carried on in these two industries, as well as many others, which the carrying capacity of this stream aids very materially; but when the Government project for the improvement of this stream is carried out the river will not only be more serviceable in the way just suggested, but will furnish a harbor of refuge to boats and other shipping engaged in that business.

When a northwesterly, westerly, or southwesterly gale is blowing these vessels are compelled to seek a safe harbor, and at present the nearest is at Tampa Bay, more than 40 miles away, as I have stated. Hence, when the waters leading from the Gulf into this river are deepened, as they will be when this project is carried out, these boats will be afforded easy access to a harbor right at hand when the storms come and they are compelled to seek shelter.

But, Mr. Chairman, Florida deserves much at the hands of the Federal Government, when her geographical position is considered. Her more southerly harbors lie nearer to the Tropics than any others on the continent, which gives those harbors an importance not only local and national, but international in their character. Already we have Porto Rico; we will always sustain the closest relations commercially and perhaps politically with Cuba; the Nicaragua Canal, the pride and the hope of America, will soon be constructed; we are reaching out to the two Americas, South and Central, and to the West Indies, for trade; and, if the path of our destiny lies, as is hoped by many, to the southward as well as to the westward, then our rivers and harbors are not local in their character, for there is not a section or State in the Union not interested in this southern trade and, consequently, in the development of those harbors; and every large port on her coast thus assumes a national importance.

Already Pensacola, Apalachicola, and Carrabelle, Tampa, Key West, and Miami, have a rapidly increasing commerce with Cuba and Central America, while Fernandina, Jacksonville, and again Miami are developing theirs with the Bermudas.

I have heard it said, Mr. Chairman, that the long railroad haul on freight would act as a deterrent to commerce through Florida ports, and especially those located in the far South; but this is not true for many reasons, prominent among which is the fact that the tendency is everywhere toward the cheapening of railroad freight rates, brought about to some extent by the improved facilities for loading and unloading of cars, for hauling them rapidly over long distances, by the increase in the carrying capacity of cars, in the power of the engines, and in the improvement of the rails and roadbeds over which these freight-laden cars are to be hauled.

Hence the difference in the cost of transportation between the longer and shorter hauls being so slight will soon cease to enter into the calculation of shippers, while rapid transit will become more and more the chief consideration; thus the Florida ports will continue to increase in importance over those on the Atlantic and Gulf farther to the northward. Who, then, can say that Florida, with all these advantages, does not deserve the few hundred thousand dollars she receives in this bill?

But, sir, her people merit some consideration at the hands of Congress, if pluck and energy count for anything. The State has been swept by tornadoes, stricken by pestilence, and visited (tropically situated though she is) by killing frosts, all within the last few years, and yet her progress has not been impeded. For many years the chief production of the largest portion of Florida has been the orange, in which industry no State or country in the world excelled her.

Millions of dollars had been invested in this industry alone, but the frosts came, and in a single night it has been estimated that more than \$25,000,000 of property was destroyed. In numerous instances the hard-earned accumulations of a lifetime were swept away; but the people were not discouraged, and that pioneer spirit which braved the savage in the early days of Florida's history, which met calmly and unflinchingly the dangers and hardships of frontier life, which cleared the forests, builded homes, and planted the garden, orchard, and farm until no land was more inviting than theirs, came to the rescue of her people in this their day of adversity, and, without a dollar of outside aid, with naught but their indomitable will and the wonderful resources of that

great State, they went to work to mend their shattered fortunes, with the result that to-day there is not a State in the Union whose people are more prosperous than are the people of my own State; her resources are being more rapidly developed than ever before, her wealth has been augmented, and her population increased, until this Congress has found it necessary to increase our representation on this floor.

The gentleman from Washington has paid a glowing tribute to his own State, and well, no doubt, does she deserve the encomium. Her people are progressive and bright has been her career in the field of advancement. But all this is true of my own State. There is no Commonwealth in this wide Union, from the East to the West, or from lake to Gulf, whose people are more progressive or which has moved more rapidly along every line of human advancement than has Florida during the last two decades.

None has a greater variety of resources, of climate, or productions; none rests beneath clearer skies or is fanned by softer breezes; none possesses more majestic rivers or more commodious and important harbors; and if the gentleman's State, lying well toward the setting sun, can draw inspiration from the fact that she approaches nearer to the Orient and our possessions in the Pacific, between which and this country thousands of miles yet intervene, the State of Florida, touching almost the shores of the Antilles, is the gateway to the countries which lie to the south of us, and she will continue to grow great and rich by reason of the commerce that will go hence to those countries and come back from them through our ports, to be scattered throughout the Atlantic seaboard and the Southern, Middle, and Northwestern States. [Applause.]

River and Harbor Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES R. THOMAS,

OF NORTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, January 14, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The pending bill carries an appropriation of \$10,000 only for Cape Fear River above Wilmington, N. C. This appropriation is for maintenance and a continuance of work under the old and existing project.

For many years past the improvement of the Cape Fear River, North Carolina, has been divided into two parts or projects, namely, one for the improvement of the Cape Fear River at and below Wilmington, N. C., the other for the improvement of the Cape Fear River above Wilmington, N. C. The improvement of this river at and below Wilmington was begun on the river channels as far back as 1829, and on the ocean bar in 1853.

Up to June 30, 1889, the Government had expended upon this project \$2,836,516.37. I mention this fact to show to the committee how important in the estimation of the Government has been the improvement of this river at its mouth and entrance into the Atlantic Ocean.

The existing project for the improvement of the Cape Fear River above Wilmington, N. C., or as it is popularly known, the Upper Cape Fear, bears date January 26, 1881, and is to clear the river to Fayetteville and to obtain a continuous channel (depth not stated) by jettying and dredging; cost estimated in July, 1893, at \$275,000 for a 4-foot depth to Elizabethtown and a 3-foot depth to Fayetteville. Of this estimated amount the sum of \$136,762.81 had been expended up to June 30, 1899. Most of this money has been expended in removing obstructions and some jettying and dredging has been done.

While the amount expended under the existing project has improved somewhat the governing low-water depth of this river and aided somewhat commerce and navigation, the improvement of the river under the existing project has been by no means adequate to the demands of or importance of the commerce of this river and its growing importance to the people of the Cape Fear section of North Carolina. Hence some fifteen months ago the business men of this section began to agitate the subject of improving the Cape Fear River between the city of Fayetteville, in my district, and the city of Wilmington, so as to secure a uniform depth of water throughout the year of 4, 6, or 8 feet. The present governing low-water depths are 2½ feet to Elizabethtown and 2 feet to Fayetteville only; and while steamers regularly navigate this river, there are seasons of the year in which navigation is delayed or is impracticable.

This movement on the part of the citizens of the city of Fayetteville has received the indorsement not only of the chamber of

commerce of that city, but of numerous chambers of commerce throughout the State, including the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce, the Wilmington Produce Exchange, the Wilmington Merchants' Association (the city of Wilmington being also greatly interested in the proposed improvement of the river), and it has also received the indorsement, by resolution, of the general assembly of North Carolina.

In fact, the improvement of the river is regarded with interest not only by the people of the Cape Fear section, but by the people of the whole State of North Carolina. The improvement of the river has attracted the attention of the State as well as the people of that section, not only because of the necessities of the case, but because of the past commercial history of the river and of the city of Fayetteville as the head of navigation thereon.

A leading newspaper of my State recently said: "The improvement of the Upper Cape Fear is a matter of great importance, in which the whole State will cooperate with Fayetteville," and one of the justices of the supreme court of North Carolina, in a paper which he was requested by the Raleigh Chamber of Commerce to write on the subject of the commercial needs of that city, urged the importance of securing the competition of water rates at our nearest river port—Fayetteville.

In the improvement of the river the pecuniary interests as well as the convenience of a large part of the population of North Carolina is involved. Competition of water rates would eventually have little effect upon the railways, because it would in time secure to them a large accession of business which the restoration of the natural trade route of the State would create, and this would many times repay them for the present small business which they would lose.

It is a well-recognized fact in North Carolina, and has been recognized for many years, that the Cape Fear River is not only the great commercial highway by water of the entire Cape Fear section of the State, and the section of country tributary thereto, but is of importance to all the State's citizens. It is the only river in the State which empties directly into the Atlantic Ocean and upon which there is foreign commerce, the port of Wilmington exporting cotton and naval stores to Europe.

In view of these facts and the importance and necessity of the improvement of this river, not only at and below the port of Wilmington, but between Wilmington and Fayetteville, and in view of the popular demand, there was incorporated in the emergency river and harbor act approved June 6, 1900, an authorization of a survey of the Upper Cape Fear River between Wilmington and Fayetteville "with a view of obtaining a navigable channel from Wilmington to Fayetteville of 4, 6, or 8 feet at mean low water." During the recess of Congress this survey was made by the local engineers, and I will append as a part of my remarks the report of Capt. E. W. Van C. Lucas of this survey.

Captain Lucas recommends, in lieu of the old and existing project, which provides only for removing obstructions and obtaining a continuous channel by means of jettying and dredging, a new project which provides for deepening the navigation of the river by means of a set of three locks, with movable dams, at an estimated cost of \$1,320,000 for a 4-foot depth and \$1,350,000 for an 8-foot depth.

It will be noted that the difference of cost between the proposed 4-foot depth and 8-foot depth amounts to the comparatively small sum of \$30,000, and the engineers recommend the adoption of one or the other of these proposed depths; and in view of the small difference in the estimated costs for the 4-foot and 8-foot depths, no estimate is submitted for the medium depth of 6 feet named by the act. Of course if the new project is adopted by Congress, the existing project of improvement by jettying and dredging will be abandoned, as recommended by Captain Lucas.

Mr. Chairman, I am most heartily in favor of the adoption of this new project and its substitution in lieu of the old project, which is entirely inadequate to meet the demands of the commerce of this river. If Congress is unwilling at this particular time to make appropriations to the extent indicated by Captain Lucas in his report, it seems to me that the importance of the commerce of the river and the past expenditures thereon will justify an appropriation of at least \$250,000, or a part of the sum estimated by Captain Lucas as the cost of the proposed depth of 8 feet from Wilmington to Fayetteville.

If it be asked why Government aid for such a large scheme of improvement should be sought for this particular river, I would say, in addition to the reasons which I have already given, in the language of the circular issued by the citizens of Fayetteville, from which I read, "A glance at the map of the Atlantic seaboard States will answer the question."

It will be seen that the coast of North Carolina juts out far beyond the general coast line; that Fayetteville, at the head of navigation on the Cape Fear River and 100 miles inland, lies on an air line between the seaports of New York and Savannah; that it is 50 miles farther west (that is, farther inland) than an air line between Norfolk and Charleston, the nearest existing "basing points for freight rates;" that the Cape Fear is the only river in North Carolina, with its 300 miles of seacoast, which flows directly into the sea; that it reaches the sea at a point where the abnormal coast line has

receded almost to the general line, and that these geographical peculiarities result in placing the head of navigation of this river nearer to a large, populous, and highly developed territory than that of any other river south of the James.

In harmony with this fact, and before natural conditions were disturbed by the north-and-south-going railways and by deforestation at the head waters of the river, Fayetteville was the shipping and receiving port for the immense territory comprised in central and western North Carolina and for parts of Virginia and South Carolina; its banking capital in 1827, when the population of this tributary territory was but half a million, was \$1,050,000, whereas its present banking capital is but \$300,000, with the population increased to 2,000,000. It was in that former period the seat of the only branch of the Bank of the United States in the State, and of an arsenal the largest, with one exception, in the Union; and it has since been distinguished from other river towns by being made a port of entry. Finally, by this last-named act, the Government in effect converted the river from Wilmington to Fayetteville into the harbor of Fayetteville, and placed itself under obligation to treat the port of Fayetteville on a plane with other ports having 2,000,000 of people dependent on them for economy in transportation.

I would also urge as an additional reason the growing advancement of the Cape Fear section of North Carolina in the manufacture of cotton goods and other manufactures and the necessity for getting the products of the cotton mills of the Cape Fear section to market by the cheapest and most accessible route. In the territory which would be opened by the increased depth of the river there are more than 40 different cotton mills, averaging from 3,000 to 20,000 spindles each; and assurances have been given that if river transportation can be secured during the entire year, twelve to fifteen new plants will be erected.

The population of the Cape Fear section benefited and involved can be stated to be, in round numbers, 61,000, including Fayetteville and Cumberland County, 30,000; Sampson County, 7,000; Bladen County, 5,000; Robeson County, 9,000; Moore County, 6,000; Harnett County, 4,000, and besides the entire territory of North Carolina east of the Blue Ridge, including a population thirty times as great, would be given a new avenue by water to market.

The estimated present commerce of the river is about 115,000 tons annually, valued about \$1,150,000, and with navigation all the year round this present business would probably at once increase 50 per cent—to 150,000 tons, valued about \$1,700,000. With certain navigation throughout the year much of the product of the aforesaid 40 mills now operating at and near Fayetteville would be shipped by river to Wilmington and thence by steamer to the North, instead of, as now, by rail to Norfolk and thence by steamer to the North. This Fayetteville mill product has an estimated value of \$5,800,000, of which three-fourths, valued at \$4,350,000, could be shipped by river. This makes a total of about \$6,000,000 worth of annual present shipments which would probably utilize the river if certain navigation were established.

There is also a possibility, and perhaps a probability, that the improvement of the river would result in the reestablishment of Fayetteville as a distributing point for a large section of the country. This point is brought out and explained in the accompanying letter from the Fayetteville citizens' committee, their claim being that Fayetteville would, under such circumstances, become such a distributing point for a section of country the business of which is estimated in their letter at 6,000,000 tons annually, valued at \$165,000,000.

I append this letter as part of my remarks. With certain navigation there would be a proper development of the Cape Fear Valley, much of which is good farming land, but under present conditions a successful crop depends entirely on the use of the river for transportation to market. During the low-water stages the farmers have the alternative of a long, costly haul or the loss of their crops, if perishable.

This section of the country is also interested in the improvement because it will afford much better mail and passenger carrying facilities than now exist. The wholesale merchants of Wilmington are much interested in the proposed improvement because it means to them a chance of extending their business to Fayetteville and vicinity.

Fayetteville, N. C., is also a port of entry, and in connection with the city of Wilmington would afford and open up a new avenue of commerce not only to Cape Fear section, but the entire State, giving for most of the year the competition of water rates at the nearest North Carolina port. Probably there is no stream in North Carolina that would bring so much in return for every dollar expended in its improvement by the Government as the Cape Fear River. The city of Fayetteville for almost a century enjoyed the advantage and distinction of being, commercially, one of the most important inland towns in the State.

This condition was brought about by its position at the head of the Cape Fear River, upon whose splendid waters all the heavy shipments of salt, iron, molasses, coffee, and merchandise generally found their way through Fayetteville all over the western counties of the State, reaching into East Tennessee and into the States to the north and south of us. The building of railroads in the last quarter of a century has deflected these shipments elsewhere, and the Cape Fear River has not received that attention which its importance to the people of a large section of North

Carolina would seem to have warranted. Latterly Fayetteville, N. C., has attracted the attention of manufacturing capitalists and is beginning to be regarded as a promising manufacturing center, as is shown by the following industries, the most of which have been erected very recently there and in vicinity:

Hope Mills, 15,000 spindles, 750 looms; Holt-Morgan Mills, 10,000 spindles, 500 looms; Holt-Williamson Mills, 5,200 spindles; Fayetteville Cotton Mills, 3,120 spindles; Bluff Mills, 200 looms; Murchison, 3,000 spindles, 100 looms; Cumberland Mills, 3,000 spindles; Ashley-Baily Mills, 100 looms; Lafayette Knitting Mills; Macy Manufacturing Company Furniture Mills; Fayetteville Cotton Oil and Fertilizer Company, 40 tons daily; Carolina Machine Shops; Ward's Foundry; Emmitt's Roller Corn Mill; Williams's Furniture Factory; McNeill's Roller Rice and Grist Mill; Clark's Machine Shop; Carolina Roller and Grist Mill; Watson Planing Machine Mill; Tobacco warehouse; Fayetteville Wooden Ware Company; Tolar-Hart-Holt Mills, 15,000 spindles; E. A. Poe's Brickyard Works; several sawmills and other industries.

It has been a source of regret to me, as the Representative of a district in which is located that portion of the Cape Fear between Fayetteville and Wilmington, that the report of the engineers upon the proposed improvement has been transmitted to Congress at so late a date as, in the opinion of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House, to preclude the consideration of the new project in the pending bill under discussion, and that they have made provision for this river only under the old project, by the small appropriation carried in the present bill.

I think the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House will bear me out in the statement that I have made every effort in my power to secure the adoption of the new project; and the matter has been urged also by a special committee of the citizens of Fayetteville in a hearing before the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Whatever action this Congress may take, I desire to show to the House the importance of the new project, and to put in a permanent form the advantages to accrue to the people of my district and State from improvement under the new project of this great river highway of commerce, and this great gateway of foreign commerce at the port of Wilmington, to the people of North Carolina.

I append, Mr. Chairman, as a part of my remarks, an article from the Fayetteville Observer upon this important subject; also letters which appeared in that paper from the citizens' committee which has been specially organized for the improvement of the Upper Cape Fear River, and also the report of the engineers:

IMPROVEMENT OF THE CAPE FEAR.

On the 8th of September, 1899, the following appeared as the leading editorial in the Observer:

"CANALIZATION OF THE CAPE FEAR.

"We do not know how nearly the jetty system which the Government has been applying to the improvement of the Cape Fear River between Wilmington and Fayetteville for some years past approaches what would be the cost of canalizing the river if that should be undertaken—we have no idea at all—but we do know that it does not begin to approach it in results.

"The improvement of waterways is carried on on a much larger and more complete scale in Europe than with us. The conditions of life are very much harder in those old countries than in this comparatively virgin land, and the incentive to make every edge cut is correspondingly greater there. But conditions are constantly growing harder with us as our population becomes denser and more 'civilized,' and we believe that the subject of the canalization of the Cape Fear is one to which serious thought may be given with a view to bringing it to the attention of Congress. Mr. THOMAS, our member, is very anxious to do everything in his power for his constituents. He will bring up the matter of the restoration to Fayetteville of a United States arsenal, and, no doubt, would take up this matter if found to be feasible.

"If the canalization project should turn out to be capable of accomplishment, so that we might have a uniform depth of, say, 6 feet of water between here and Wilmington the year round, the completion of such work would give an impetus to the growth of Fayetteville which would be phenomenal.

"By the canalization of rivers we mean such work as has been done on the Weser in Germany, on the Clyde and Tees in Scotland, and on the Seine in France. We do not know what may be the state of the work on those rivers now—no doubt far in advance of their condition at the time we are going to speak of.

"But in 1890, at the International Congress on Internal Navigation, Herr Franzius, of Germany, Voisin Bey (chief engineer of the Suez Canal), and Mr. Vernon Harcourt, of England, all engineers of the first order, gave minute descriptions of improvements on the rivers mentioned, and others, which had been effected by a system of longitudinal dikes—narrowing the channel and producing the scouring effect which Captain Eads accomplished with his sunken wicker 'mattresses' in the Mississippi below New Orleans years ago—that were astonishing. Cross dikes, where needed, and sluices for high water and storage dams for low water, are details of the general system familiar to engineers.

"Herr Franzius said (at the time we allude to) that between Bremen and Bremerhaven the Weser had been greatly deepened and when the work was completed (in four years more) it would be navigable at all seasons at a uniform depth.

"The matter is worth looking into, now that we have undertaken to put Fayetteville in the front rank of towns."

This article attracted widespread interest and engaged the attention of Captain Lucas, the Government engineer officer at Wilmington, who subsequently, upon invitation, visited our chamber of commerce. The result of his visit was his determination to look carefully into the matter of permanently improving the Cape Fear River between Wilmington and Fayetteville, either by canalization proper or by slack water—that is, the use of dams and locks—as a survey might demonstrate to be suited to this particular stream.

In November following we reprinted the subjoined article from the Raleigh News and Observer:

"THE WHOLE STATE WILL COOPERATE WITH FAYETTEVILLE."

"The Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce is moving to secure Congressional action looking to the improvement of the Cape Fear River from Fayetteville to Wilmington. This is timely. For many years water transportation by the Cape Fear made Fayetteville the first business center of the State. With its new manufacturing interests and the fact that three railroads are each looking to make Fayetteville their Eastern terminus, the improvement of the Cape Fear becomes a matter of great importance, in which the whole State will cooperate with Fayetteville."

On December 1 following the chamber of commerce addressed a letter to the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce asking its cooperation, which after the removal of some objections arising from a misunderstanding of the effect of the proposed work was cordially and heartily given.

Later, upon the suggestion of Captain Lucas, an appropriation was secured from Congress, just before its adjournment in June last, for a preliminary survey of the river. This was completed a short time since and demonstrated the necessity for adopting the slack-water system (with two locks between here and Wilmington) on account of the insufficiency of the flow of water in the summer for canalization proper—an insufficiency resulting from the increasing effects of deforestation.

While the entire feasibility of the project as a matter of engineering was conceded by Captain Lucas from the start, it was necessary to demonstrate its commercial propriety before he could recommend to his superiors in the War Department the expenditure of the large sum required, and without his recommendation it was understood to be useless to move in the legislative branch of the Government.

In reply to inquiries from Captain Lucas, Secretary Rose, of the chamber of commerce, addressed him the following letter:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Fayetteville, N. C., October 25, 1900.

E. W. VAN COURT LUCAS,
Captain, Corps of Engineers, U. S. A., Wilmington, N. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to my letter of August 9, regarding the improvement of the Upper Cape Fear, I will say that the present tonnage of the steamboat lines per month is about 8,000 tons; and the railroad now handles about 1,315 tons of freight per month that would be handled by river traffic if the river was navigable at all times, giving uninterrupted traffic. There is already erected and in operation in the territory which would be benefited by the increased depth of the river 41 different cotton mills, ranging from 3,000 to 20,000 spindles each.

The product of these mills is largely transported by railroad, but would be transported by steamer with assurance of uninterrupted river transportation. There are some twelve to fifteen large mill plants that are only waiting the assurance that the river transportation will be improved to be erected; and in some instances the capital has already been subscribed. The industries mentioned do not include large mercantile interests or small mills and shops other than textile mills; the tonnage of the unmentioned plants will be considerable. We attach hereto a map of North Carolina, marking under red lines the territory that will be largely benefited by an increased depth of the river. You will please calculate the area of territory in the marked lines that will receive direct benefit from the increased depth of the Upper Cape Fear River.

It may be added that two railroads now looking in this direction will seek Fayetteville as their terminus as soon as they have assurance of year-round water in the Cape Fear.

Bearing on this point, please note the following extract from the Raleigh News and Observer of October 21, in which these remarks by Supreme Court Justice Walter Clark are recorded (Supreme Court Justice Walter Clark to Raleigh Chamber of Commerce, in Raleigh News and Observer of October 21, 1900):

"The railroad now running down through southern Wake should be extended to Fayetteville, some 60 miles from Raleigh, thus giving us for most of the year the competition of water rates at our nearest river port."

If there is any further information necessary to secure the improvement of the river, you will please advise me and oblige,

Yours, truly,
F. R. ROSE,
Secretary Chamber of Commerce.

The statistics supplied in the foregoing not being sufficiently explicit, Captain Lucas visited Fayetteville again (on November 15, just past), and explained to a meeting of our citizens the necessity for supplying him with more detailed information. It was pointed out that this would have been done in the first instance except for the political campaign which was then engrossing attention. As the outcome of Captain Lucas's visit, a committee was appointed and immediately set to work. The result was a report sent to him on November 21, a copy of which is appended.

[Improvement of the Cape Fear—Report of the committee.]

FAYETTEVILLE, N. C., November 21, 1900.

Capt. E. W. VAN C. LUCAS,
Corps of Engineers, U. S. A., Wilmington, N. C.

SIR: The undersigned, the committee appointed at the citizens' meeting held on the occasion of your visit on Thursday last, have taken up the subjects of inquiry suggested by you, and have pleasure in reporting as follows:

THE PRESENT RIVER TRAFFIC.

The tonnage of the traffic by the steamboats between this city and Wilmington, as reported to the United States engineer's office at Wilmington for the year ending December 31, 1899, was, in round numbers, 115,000. We are informed that its value would average \$10 per ton, which would give a total value of \$1,150,000.

EXISTING LOCAL RAILWAY TRAFFIC WHICH WOULD SEEK THE RIVER IF IMPROVED.

In reply to printed forms issued to our merchants, traders, and manufacturers, made out, where necessary, under our supervision, we find that there have been received at and shipped from Fayetteville by rail during the past twelve months 112,235 tons of merchandise of all kinds, valued at \$5,812,614. It is estimated that at least three-fourths of this would at once be diverted to the river for transportation if the proposed improvement were made, and the speedy and regular dispatch of freight, which it would make possible, were established.

TRAFFIC FROM A DISTANCE WHICH WOULD BE DIVERTED TO THE RIVER IF FAYETTEVILLE WERE MADE A "BASING POINT."

We are informed that as soon as the proposed improvement in navigation and the dispatch of freights is effected Fayetteville would be made with the traffic managers call a basing point for freight rates. The effect of this, we are informed, will be to cause all railways which run within the territory

thus tributary to Fayetteville to make rates from Fayetteville. By the term "the territory thus tributary to Fayetteville" we mean all the country which is nearer to Fayetteville than to any other basing point, the railway commission laws requiring the rates therein to be proportionately less than to such other basing points.

We inclose a map (see envelope marked Exhibit A) which will show the territory thus delimited as tributary to Fayetteville. The basing points nearest to Fayetteville are Richmond and Norfolk, Va., on the north and Charleston, S. C., on the south. We have drawn lines at right angles across air lines between Fayetteville and the three cities named, respectively, and at points midway between Fayetteville and them. Line A is the dividing line between Richmond and Fayetteville; line B, the dividing line between Norfolk and Fayetteville, and line C, that between Charleston and Fayetteville.

It will be seen that, while the northeast section of North Carolina falls within the territory allotted to Richmond and Norfolk, a considerable portion of southwest Virginia and a considerable portion of northeast South Carolina, each larger than the first mentioned, falls within the territory of Fayetteville. As the improvements referred to would also cause Wilmington to be made a basing point, the map would be changed thereby to a comparatively small extent, the effect of the change being to add more to the joint territory of Wilmington and Fayetteville.

We also inclose a copy of a United States Government report on the Manchester Ship Canal (see envelope marked "Exhibit B"), in which is described (pp. 5-9) the manner employed in Great Britain for "proving" a commercial reason for the granting of a charter by Parliament for such an undertaking. We shall in this case employ the same method, in a general way, because such matters in the older countries have necessarily reached a more exact standard. An important consideration in our favor in relying upon such a method is the fact that the railway commission laws in this country now require connecting lines to transport freight delivered to them, whether a tariff of through rates has been established or not, and, as before mentioned, at rates proportioned to the "length of haul."

Without entering upon a consideration of how far westward beyond the borders of North Carolina the traffic influence of the proposed improvement would extend, we ask attention to the significant coincidence that the territory now delimited on our map is almost the same as that which was tributary to Fayetteville in the last of the eighteenth century and in the first part of the present century up to the railroad era. The fact that Canova's statue of Washington was brought from Italy to Wilmington, was thence landed at Fayetteville, and finally hauled overland to Raleigh in the latter period, is merely an illustration of the general conditions of transportation at that time.

The proposed improvement, therefore, would not establish a novel condition, but would restore the normal relation of the Cape Fear to a vast territory, which the overworking of the railroad idea and the effect of deforestation upon the water courses have disturbed. Or we may state the case this way: That it would be the reestablishment of normal conditions by a development of the problem of transportation, which conditions had been disturbed by a cruder stage of the movement.

Within the limitations of our map, as thus restricted, it will be seen that there is a population equal to that of the State of North Carolina (some 1,900,000). The population which, by a liberal estimate, might be considered as involved, in one way or another, in the production of the existing river traffic and the existing railway traffic divertible to the river, in and out of Fayetteville, may be said to include that of Cumberland County, in which Fayetteville lies (30,000), and one-fourth of that of the contiguous counties of Sampson (7,000), Bladen (5,000), Robeson (9,000), Moore (6,000), and Harnett (4,000)—a total of 61,000. The territory, then, on the map, this side the Blue Ridge, contains a population thirty times as great as the population at present tributary to Fayetteville.

We therefore have this proposition:

	Tons.	Value.
Existing river traffic.....	115,000	\$1,150,000
Three-fourths (the divertible portion) of existing railway traffic, in and out of Fayetteville, $\frac{3}{4}$ by 112,235 tons and $\frac{1}{4}$ by \$5,812,614.....	84,221	4,359,400
In round numbers.....	200,000	5,500,000
Thirty times these figures would give the tonnage and value of traffic which, other things being equal, would find a cheaper route to and from the great markets by way of the Cape Fear River, if improved as suggested; that is, 30 by 200,000 tons, and 30 by \$5,500,000.....	6,000,000	165,000,000

In this connection it is worth noting that Mr. Walter L. Holt, one of the chief owners of cotton mills in this county and in Alamance County, a hundred miles distant, finds that he gets his oils, dyes, and machinery and ships his finished products by river from his Fayetteville (Cumberland) mills for an average of but half the freight rate which he is obliged to pay by rail to and from his Alamance mills.

THE RAILWAY COMMISSION'S FIGURES.

We further inclose a letter from the North Carolina corporation (railway) commission (see envelope marked Exhibit C), from which it will be seen that the actual freight traffic movement for the past year over the roads converging at Fayetteville and within the territory indicated on our map amounted to 1,497,979 tons, or one-fourth of the tonnage (6,000,000) which we have estimated by the per capita method for the whole territory east of the mountains. It will be observed, also, that the commission's letter expresses the hope that "the Government will see the importance of this station (Fayetteville) which, by reason of its situation, should again become the distributing point for the central and western North Carolina territory."

Attention may also be called to the fact that Fayetteville, at the head of navigation 100 miles inland, is the only point on the Atlantic Coast Line between Richmond and Charleston (the present basing points) which is situated on navigable water.

How far the inertia of settled routes of trade may act in restraint of the possibilities indicated above is of course a matter of conjecture.

THE COMMERCIAL CASE.

We assume that while the Government undertakes works of the kind now proposed for the public benefit and without expectation of a direct return for the outlay, it is nevertheless influenced by the same considerations which influence private capitalists. That is to say, if the cost of the proposed improvement should be \$1,000,000, it would be a sound commercial undertaking.

commending itself to the Government from this point of view, if the additional traffic secured by reason of the outlay, or the resultant economies of transportation on existing traffic, should yield 5 per cent on that amount—5 per cent on \$1,000,000 is \$50,000.

It is apparent that the economies of transportation which such an improvement would render possible—twelve months' running of the boats instead of nine months; the cheaper proportionate handling of larger loads, etc.—would leave a margin for tolls for the use of the improved waterway, if the work were done by a private corporation, far in excess of the reasonable rate of 5 per cent on a million dollars. An average of 25 cents a ton on the class of freight (115,000 tons) now carried by the river and of 50 cents a ton on the class of freight (84,221 tons) now carried by the railways in and out of Fayetteville, but divertible to the river, would produce a revenue of \$70,800, or over 7 per cent on the existing Fayetteville traffic alone.

A toll of 10 cents a ton would more than pay for the whole investment of \$1,000,000 in two years if all the traffic of the tributary country were diverted this way. Such speculations as to what might be done if the river were the property of private capitalists instead of that of the Government are useful as indicating how very far within the margin of commercial safety the Government would be acting if it should make such an expenditure.

We desire, in conclusion, to heartily reiterate for ourselves the expression of thanks which the meeting that appointed us unanimously voted to you, sir, for the interest which you have taken in this great work.

We remain, with high esteem, yours, obediently,

E. J. HALE.	W. M. MORGAN.
W. L. HOLT.	A. H. SLOCOMB.
F. R. ROSE.	H. C. BASH.
R. L. WILLIAMS.	J. A. KING.
	W. S. COOK.

Mayor of Fayetteville and Chairman of Citizens' Meeting.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE CAPE FEAR.

The navigation committee is sending out the following letter to mayors and chambers of commerce of North Carolina cities and to members-elect to the legislature:

CITIZENS' COMMITTEE ON IMPROVEMENT OF THE CAPE FEAR,
Fayetteville, N. C., December 6, 1900.

DEAR SIR: Some fifteen months ago the business men of this section began to agitate the subject of improving the Cape Fear River between this city and Wilmington, so as to secure a uniform minimum depth of water throughout the year of 4, 6, or 8 feet. Such control of internal waterways by engineering devices is common in the highly civilized States of western Europe, and it seemed to us that there was no reason why our own great country, with its vaster wealth, should lag behind those naturally less favored nations in its treatment of such an important matter.

In North Carolina the Cape Fear River would, of course, first attract the Government's attention if it should share our views on the general subject, because of the commercial history of the river, and of Fayetteville as the head of navigation thereon, in the period before the railroad era disturbed natural conditions. Even since that era set in, and in the face of the changed conditions of transportation which it established, the Government has felt called upon to take over control of the river between Wilmington and Fayetteville, and to make Fayetteville a port of entry. Replacing the old Cape Fear Navigation Company, which operated under the State's charter, it has sought by a system of jetties to arrest the effect of deforestation upon the river's water supply.

The object of the movement which we are now bringing to your attention is to induce the Government to substitute for this crude and insufficient method the modern system of treatment of internal waterways which is employed in Europe, and which is now being taken up in some portions of this country.

The proposition to this end at once engaged the attention of Captain Lucas, the enlightened engineer officer of the United States Army stationed at Wilmington. At his suggestion, an appropriation for a preliminary survey of the river between Wilmington and Fayetteville was secured just before the adjournment of Congress in June last. The survey was completed in November and the fact demonstrated that, by the construction of two or more locks, a uniform minimum depth of water of 4, 6, or 8 feet could be secured throughout the year, according to the appropriation which might be made by Congress.

The movement for this appropriation has been chiefly conducted by the Chamber of Commerce of Fayetteville, but it has been heartily taken up and approved by the Chamber of Commerce of Wilmington and by the Produce Exchange and the Merchants' Association of that city. It has also attracted widespread interest beyond the Cape Fear section, and so far as we are informed, is approved throughout the State. The Raleigh News and Observer, for example, said: "The improvement of the Cape Fear becomes a matter of great importance, in which the whole State will cooperate with Fayetteville." More recently, Justice Walter Clark, in a paper which he was requested by the Raleigh Chamber of Commerce to write on the subject of the commercial needs of that city, urged the importance of securing "the competition of water rates at our nearest river port," Fayetteville.

On the 15th of November just past Captain Lucas explained to a meeting of our citizens the necessity for demonstrating that the interests involved were sufficient to justify the Government's action before he could recommend such an appropriation as would be required. The undersigned were appointed a committee for that purpose, and their report is appended. By this you will see that the "commercial case" is proved many times over, and that the pecuniary interest of nearly the whole population of North Carolina, as well as the convenience of most of them, is involved.

Attention is asked to the obvious fact that while the proposed improvement would result in a relocation of the points of freight dispersion entirely in the interest of North Carolina the effect upon the railways within our borders would be to secure eventually a large accession of business which the restoration of the natural trade route of the State would create, and that this would many times repay them for the comparatively small business which they would lose.

Our object in addressing this communication to you is to ask your earnest cooperation with us in bringing every available influence to bear on Congress in behalf of this great work.

We request a reply, with such suggestions as may occur to you, and have the honor to be, dear sir,

Yours, respectfully,

E. J. HALE.	W. S. COOK.
W. L. HOLT.	A. H. SLOCOMB.
F. R. ROSE.	H. C. BASH.
R. L. WILLIAMS.	J. A. KING.
W. M. MORGAN.	

PLAN AND ESTIMATE OF COST OF PROVIDING A SUFFICIENT WIDTH AND DEPTH IN WILMINGTON HARBOR, NORTH CAROLINA, TO PERMIT VESSELS NOW USING SAID HARBOR TO TURN OR SWING AROUND THEREIN, AND SURVEY OF CAPE FEAR RIVER WITH A VIEW TO OBTAINING A NAVIGABLE CHANNEL FROM WILMINGTON TO FAYETTEVILLE OF 4, 6, OR 8 FEET AT MEAN LOW WATER.

UNITED STATES ENGINEER OFFICE,
Wilmington, N. C., November 24, 1900.

GENERAL: In compliance with letter from your office dated August 23, 1900, I have the honor to submit the following report on proposed anchorage basin at Wilmington, N. C., and proposed improvement of Cape Fear River between Wilmington and Fayetteville, N. C. This survey was authorized under the emergency river and harbor act of June 6, 1900, as follows:

"Wilmington Harbor: With a view to providing a sufficient width and depth to permit vessels now using said harbor to turn or swing around therein; Cape Fear River, with a view to obtaining a navigable channel from Wilmington to Fayetteville of 4, 6, or 8 feet at mean low water."

The above authority includes two distinct items, which will be considered separately.

IMPROVING CAPE FEAR RIVER BETWEEN WILMINGTON AND FAYETTEVILLE.

The object of this improvement is to obtain all the year round depth of not less than 4 feet, which will involve the improvement of about 70 miles of river on which the present governing depths are 2 feet at ordinary low water and 9 inches at extreme low water. Such low-water depths now result in a practical suspension of navigation during three or four months annually, with the result that the stream is useless for purposes of navigation during a third of the year, and much business which would go to it if certain navigation were assured is now always shipped by rail and at a higher rate.

The estimated present commerce is about 115,000 tons annually, valued at \$1,150,000, and with navigation all the year round this present business would probably at once increase at least 50 per cent, to over 170,000 tons, valued at about \$1,700,000. With certain navigation throughout the year much of the product of about 40 mills now operating at and near Fayetteville would be shipped by river to Wilmington, and thence by steamer to the North, instead of, as now, by rail to Norfolk and thence by steamer to the North. This Fayetteville mill product has an estimated value of \$5,800,000, of which three-fourths, valued at \$4,350,000, could be shipped by river. This makes a total of about \$6,000,000 worth of annual present shipments which would probably utilize the river if certain navigation were established.

As to probable development resulting from the improved navigation, it is claimed in Fayetteville that twelve or fifteen mill enterprises, some with capital already subscribed, are only waiting assurance of certain river navigation to begin the construction of buildings and plant at that city.

There is also a possibility, and perhaps a probability, of the improvement of the river resulting in the reestablishment of Fayetteville as a distributing point for a large section of the country. This point is brought out and explained in the accompanying letter from the Fayetteville citizens' committee, their claim being that Fayetteville would, under such circumstances, become such distributing point for a section of country the business of which is estimated in their letter at 6,000,000 tons annually, valued at \$165,000,000.

With certain navigation there would be a probable development of the Cape Fear River Valley, much of which is good farming land. Under present conditions the success of a year's crop depends entirely on the use of the river for transportation to market. During low-water stages the farmers have the alternative of a long, costly haul or the loss of their crop, if perishable. This section of the country is also interested in the proposed improvement because it will afford much better mail and passenger carrying facilities than now exist.

The wholesale merchants of Wilmington are much interested in the proposed improvement because it means to them a chance of extending their business to Fayetteville and vicinity, which they can not now get because unable to compete with merchants of Richmond and Norfolk, Va., on account of existing rail rates, although Fayetteville is only 83 miles by rail from Wilmington, while it is 211 miles by rail from Richmond and 204 miles from Norfolk.

The interest of Fayetteville is much greater than that of Wilmington, because, although at the head of navigation, its water route to the North can not now compete with the rail routes. North-bound shipments are now usually sent by rail to Norfolk, and thence by water north. All railroads now entering Fayetteville belong to one system, and there is practically no competition. The accompanying letter from the citizens of Fayetteville states the case in a concise and comprehensive form, and shows a probable immediate business affecting Fayetteville of approximately \$5,500,000 annually.

Reference has already been made to the possible much greater interest affected if the improvement of the waterway resulted in the establishment of Fayetteville as a distributing point.

Estimates are called for to obtain a depth of 4 feet, 6 feet, or 8 feet at all seasons. The least depth mentioned, 4 feet, can, in my opinion, be obtained with certainty only by a system of locks and dams, as the low-water discharge at Fayetteville is about 212 cubic feet per second, and the fall in the 70 miles below Fayetteville about 20 feet.

The river has been under improvement about twenty years, under a project to clear the river to Fayetteville and obtain a continuous channel—depth not stated—by jettying and dredging, at a cost estimated, in 1893, at \$275,000, of which about half has been spent. The appropriations have been spread over so many years, and in such small amounts, that the improvement thus far attained is local in character, and the present governing depth between Wilmington and Fayetteville is little, if any, better than it was twenty years ago. With an expenditure of \$135,000, in addition to as much already spent, it is believed that the low-water depth can be increased about 1 foot, making the governing depth 21 inches, instead of about 9 inches, as at present. I do not believe it possible to obtain a navigable channel of 4 feet certain depth at all seasons by jettying and dredging.

The minimum depth proposed, 4 feet, can be obtained with certainty by the construction of 3 locks with movable dams, the locations of which are approximately shown in the accompanying profile sheet of the Cape Fear River; such locks to have a lift of 8 feet. By making the lift 9 feet, instead of 8 feet, and doing a little dredging, the maximum proposed depth, 8 feet, could be obtained. The difference in cost of 4 feet and 8 feet navigation would probably not exceed \$30,000—a little over 2 per cent of the cost of obtaining 4 feet navigation. This difference between costs for 4 feet and 8 feet navigation is so small that it is not deemed necessary to estimate the cost of the intermediate depth of 6 feet.

The form of lock and dam proposed is similar to those used in Kanawha River, and consists of a lock of 8 feet lift, with a chamber 150 feet long and 28 feet wide, and a movable dam about 170 feet long. Such a lock will accommodate any boat capable of navigating the river. Movable dams are deemed necessary because the river is subject to freshets ranging from 40 to 60 feet at Fayetteville to 20 to 30 feet at the lowest proposed lock.

The estimate is as follows:

Three locks, as above described, with movable dams, \$400,000 each.	\$1,200,000
Superintendence and contingencies, 10 per cent.	120,000

Total	1,320,000
-------	-----------

This estimate may appear excessive, but it should be borne in mind that there is no solid rock for foundations, and the estimates are based on bottom of foundations at about 28 feet below low-water surface. In addition, the stream has caving banks, necessitating bank protection for an unusually long distance below each dam, to protect from scour.

This proposed expenditure of \$1,320,000 is for the benefit of an actual present commerce valued at about \$6,000,000 annually, on which, according to the Fayetteville citizens' letter, there would be a resulting saving in rates of about \$70,000 annually, which is over 5 per cent of the estimated cost. On this basis, and for the reasons outlined above and elaborated in the accompanying letters from the citizens' committee of Fayetteville, and the chamber of commerce, produce exchange, and Merchants' Association of Wilmington, I consider the improvement a worthy one and recommend that it be undertaken by the United States.

There are forwarded herewith, under separate cover, a map of Wilmington Harbor, one sheet of profiles of Cape Fear River between Wilmington and Fayetteville, and two sheets of cross sections of river bed and valley at proposed lock and dam sites.

Respectfully submitted.

E. W. VAN C. LUCAS,
Captain, Corps of Engineers.

Brig. Gen. JOHN M. WILSON,
Chief of Engineers, U. S. A.

American Money Should be Spent in American Waters and on American Soil.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY C. SMITH,

OF MICHIGAN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 9, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am anxious to join the harmony among the members from Michigan. [Laughter.] The real fact is that by reason of this kind of harmony or the want of it among the members from Michigan, as I apprehend, there is an item in this bill which should not be there and which, when the time comes, I shall move to strike out. It is found on page 65 of the bill, and provides for an appropriation of \$500,000 for the construction of Plan A, referred to in House Doc. No. 712.

Now, there are three channels in the Detroit River opposite Ecorse, Wyandotte, and Trenton. One is the Canadian channel, which is classed in this report as Plan A. This is the channel on the Canadian side. That is what I object to. I object to the American Congress spending more money to construct, to enlarge, and to maintain a ship channel on the borders of Canada. In the early days the channel was along the American side, extending from Trenton clear up to the city of Detroit. But, for certain reasons which I can not fathom, of late the money has been appropriated for and the channel has been changed over to the Canadian side, where the bottom is all rock, where it has to be blasted out at large expense, and where boats get across the channel and impede navigation.

And I ask gentlemen to read report 712, in which it will be seen that the engineer has made his estimates, wherein he claims it will only take about \$2,000,000 more to complete, according to this plan, the channel on the Canadian side. It will cost about \$10,000,000, according to his statement, to complete the central channel between the two, and he estimates that it will take \$13,000,000 to complete the American channel and make it what it should be. But I respectfully call attention to the fact that these are only estimates. They are stated to be estimates, and I am unable to find that any survey or any soundings have ever been made as a basis upon which this estimate is made.

And I want to say, further, that the engineer or the assistant engineer who makes this report, Mr. Dickinson, as I am informed, lives in Amherstburg, Canada, right across the river from Wyandotte. His property is there, and my constituents in Wyandotte advise me that they have never had an opportunity to have any conference with him or opportunity to make any statements to him. Before the Canadian channel was opened there were three shipyards in Trenton at the south end of the island. When the Canadian channel was built up, these shipyards perished. Within the last three years a shipyard of considerable importance has been built up at Wyandotte. This engineer made no report in favor of any assistance to the harbor at Wyandotte, but I will say in behalf of the committee, all the members of which have been very courteous to me, that they have not neglected that matter.

I want to say further that those who know Colonel BISHOP

know that he needs no defense as to his honor, his ability, or his integrity on the floor of this House. I went to the committee, and when I explained to them the conditions they authorized an appropriation, which is in the bill, which is satisfactory and which will assist the harbor at Wyandotte so that the shipyard may be used. But I want to submit this: It has been stated here that 35,000,000 tons of freight pass through the Detroit River every year; that six times as great a tonnage passes through that river as through the Suez Canal. I will not be outdone by my brother from the First district [Mr. CORLISS] in my praise and my love for my beloved State of Michigan, but I do want to submit that the facts show that the city of Wyandotte, in the district which I have the honor to represent, is the third city in the State of Michigan in the amount of freight handled, the cities in their relative importance as to the amount of freight handled being Detroit, Grand Rapids, and Wyandotte.

In the latter city there originates every year more than one million and a half tons of freight, or about one-thirtieth as much as passes through the entire Detroit River. And I want to say that there is no boat of any kind which ever stops at Wyandotte to get one ton of that freight. This \$20,000,000 spent on our Great Lakes is spent for the benefit of four cities—Chicago, Duluth, Cleveland, and Buffalo. Now, I submit that if we are legislating for the general good of the greatest number, some provision should be made whereby boats might touch the wharves at Wyandotte; that could gather up the million and a half tons of freight that originates there every year.

There is no competition there either. There is the Michigan Central Railroad, and what they call the Lima Northern, a little road 80 miles long, which starts nowhere and ends nowhere as an independent line, something like the railroad spoken of by the chairman of this committee as one of Jules Verne's dreams. Having been one of the promoters of the Detroit and Lima Northern Railroad, I do not want to give it a black eye, but it is said that its initials D. & L. N. stand for "Dead and Left Nothing." [Laughter.] While it has done somewhat to relieve the shippers of our district, it has not accomplished the purpose indicated in the report of the engineer who had under investigation the conditions of the Detroit River at these points.

But really it affords no real, substantial competition. I only speak of it because this report says my constituents have ample shipping facilities and full competition with the Lima Northern and the Michigan Central railroads. I know that the Michigan Central is a great system, and by the courtesy of the committee, when it went through the Wyandotte Channel, I was invited to be its guest, and with that committee was the general attorney of the Michigan Central Railroad. For what purpose? It was not a day that he went for pleasure in the rain; but he was there with the committee. I asked one of the members of the committee why he was there, and he said he did not know. [Laughter.] What I am submitting is this: My constituents are left absolutely at the mercy of the Michigan Central Railroad.

Mr. KLUTTZ. May I interrupt the gentleman one moment?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. KLUTTZ. I desire to ask him if it is one of the legitimate purposes of this bill to furnish competition to the shipping interests of the large cities of the country?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I supposed it was for the general interest of the shipping. If I am wrong I should be glad to be put right. I did not suppose it was for the benefit of the great ship-owners and boat owners of this country. I will admit, however, that those great boats have pretty nearly driven the small boats from the lakes up in my country.

Now, I have not, Mr. Chairman, attained that advance in science where I can contemplate the science of the dam proposed by the able Representative of the First district of Michigan. I can not conceive how a dam can be constructed or a breakwater, at Buffalo, which will raise the water 18 inches at Wyandotte when the water is low and will not raise it at all when the water is high. [Laughter.] That is one of those paradoxes that is only equalled by the result of the bill we passed yesterday concerning Colorado. It is a paradox, if any such thing could exist. Let me submit this: In Wyandotte we have one concern that makes 300 tons of its product and ships it every day. It burns 500 tons of coal and 200 tons of coke every day. There are 57 salt wells there, too. These salt wells yield, on an average, 300 barrels of salt every day. If the water at high-water mark or low-water mark were raised 18 inches it would destroy them, and if we should pass a law which destroyed that property, as a legal proposition, I submit we would be bound to pay for it.

In addition to that, if you raise the water by a dam of this kind it would not only flood a great part of my district, but a large part of the low country between Buffalo and the city of Detroit, about Toledo and all those cities, filling up the sewers, flooding the streets, filling the wells, and the damage could not be estimated. So thus far I am in harmony with the committee in this proposition. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the rest of my time.

Mr. BALL. Will the gentleman from Michigan, before he takes his seat, give the balance of the committee a certificate of character as well as Colonel BISHOP?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Every man in Michigan is all right, except one who lived in Texas once. [Laughter.]

Mr. BALL. I mean the balance of the River and Harbor Committee.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Oh, yes; certainly. I have done so already.

During the discussion of this bill by my colleague from the First [Mr. CORLISS] the following took place. I read from the RECORD, page 829:

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Will the gentleman permit a question?
Mr. CORLISS. Yes.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. How much will your proposed dam raise the water at Wyandotte and Trenton?

Mr. CORLISS. The water at Wyandotte would be raised about 18 inches above low-water mark, but would not be raised a particle above high-water mark.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. That would flood much of that territory there, would it not?

Mr. CORLISS. The gentleman did not understand my proposition. The opinion of these engineers can not be questioned either by the gentleman or myself, and their statement is that this dam will raise the mean level of the water 2 feet above low-water mark and maintain it there without raising high-water mark an inch. Consequently the high-water mark at Wyandotte after the construction of the dam will not be one particle higher than it is now without the dam.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Is it not a fact that at high-water mark a good deal of that country is under water?

Mr. CORLISS. At high-water mark some portions of the land along the Detroit River and on Lake Erie are under water. But that condition of affairs has existed ever since white men have lived on the shores of those waters, and that condition of affairs will continue for all time. It is proposed by this dam so to regulate it as not to allow the water to overflow any more than it now does at high water, but the mean level would be maintained 2 feet higher than low-water mark now.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Do you not think that all the riparian owners between Buffalo and Chicago would have a claim against the Government for flooding their property?

Mr. CORLISS. On the contrary, if the water is not raised above what it now is at high water, how can they make any claim? And the engineers state, and give reasons that are absolutely conclusive to any man who will read them, that they will not raise the high-water mark a particle upon any of the waters that they propose to affect. I understand, Mr. Chairman, how it appears to a man who has not studied the question. It seems probable that if you raise the mean level of a body of water you would affect its high-water mark; but when you understand the proposition made by the eminent engineers, which no man with a knowledge of the subject has ever dared to question, you will understand that high-water mark will not be raised a particle. Therefore it does not affect the riparian interest in the slightest degree.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Will the gentleman permit another question?
Mr. CORLISS. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. As a legal proposition, do you not think that the riparian owner has the right to have the low-water mark maintained during the season of low water?

Mr. CORLISS. I think not, where for a century it has been a well-known fact that these fluctuations have been going on, and the rights of the riparian owner have been acquired since the course of nature was established. A man has no legal right to demand the control of nature, and this does not propose to affect that in the slightest degree.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Is not the legal proposition this, that a man's riparian rights follow the advancing shore?

Mr. CORLISS. The gentleman is trying to discuss a proposition which is not involved in this question, and he either does not understand the position taken by the engineers or does not wish to comprehend the proposition that I have made.

Mr. BISHOP. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. CORLISS. Let me answer my colleague [Mr. HENRY C. SMITH] first. I have simply stated that the regulating dam proposed will raise the level of the water on Lake Erie 2 feet above low-water mark and maintain that depth for navigable purposes. It will affect Lake Erie and the harbors of the Detroit River and Lake Huron and Lake Michigan in proportion to the stemming of the tide that flows down and the volume of water that is necessary to regulate its height. It will not affect any property interests, because it will not raise the water at its highest period in the year in the slightest degree. Now I will yield to my colleague [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. Chairman, I now submit that as a legal proposition my position is a correct one and that my constituents have a right to be protected from such an unwarranted destruction of their property, and that if this plan should be carried out this Government would be made to pay large damages on account of flooding land all the way from Buffalo to Detroit.

Mr. Chairman, the amendments I propose I submit ought to be adopted. Before discussing them I will read them into the RECORD, as follows:

Insert at the end of line 15, page 65, after word "appropriated," the following:

"Provided, That no part of said money shall be available until the further survey mentioned in House Document No. 712, first session Fifty-sixth Congress, shall have been completed, and the detailed plans and estimates therein also mentioned submitted, and the cost according to Plan C ascertained, a report of which shall be submitted to Congress, for its guidance, as soon as practicable: And provided further, That all boats which shall use said channel shall be common carriers and shall touch at all points, wharves, harbors, and docks where the previous year shows 100,000 tons of freight shipped, or more, and shall afford equal, equitable, and just shipping facilities to all shippers."

Mr. Chairman, it will be seen that my proposed amendments only require that the matter should be put off until plans and surveys are made so that it shall be known for certain whether the American channel or the Canadian channel would be the cheapest or the best.

On March 3, 1899, a survey was authorized, looking toward a channel 21 feet deep. On June 4, last, Colonel Lydecker made his preliminary report. General Wilson, in transmitting this, uses, on page 2 of his report, the following language:

Lieutenant-Colonel Lydecker presents three plans, A, B, and C, and while he believes that Plans A and B, or a combination of them, are the only ones calling for serious consideration, neither time nor data now available permit a conclusive discussion of the matter at present. It is proposed to make further surveys during the present season in relation to these plans, and it is expected that a final report, with detailed plans and estimates, will be submitted in time for consideration by Congress at its next session.

Now, it will be seen that these surveys have not been made, and it is not fair to appropriate \$500,000 until it is definitely known which channel is the better one. It will be noted, on the same page, that this is headed "Preliminary report."

Assistant Engineer Dixon, referred to on the same page, lives in Amherstburg, Canada; has his property there, and his sympathies are there; and it is his desire to have the channel there and to have American money spent there, and Canadian laborers, engineers, surveyors, dredgers, and divers employed there; the boats furnished with coal and other supplies there. And I want to say that since the Canadian channel has been in active use the little retail stores over there in Canada have done a wholesale business, and the little coal shops have become wholesale docks. This little burg is waxing fat and growing rich off from the appropriations of the American Congress. This is not fair and it is not right. My constituents believe, with Ruskin, that life without toil is criminal. And they claim this toil as theirs, or at least an opportunity to compete for it.

Further down on the same page he says:

It is therefore requested that this report be regarded as a preliminary one.

It also appears, same page:

The improved channel now has a depth of 18½ feet in its shoalest parts, with a minimum width of 300 feet.

It will be seen that there is no crying need to improve a channel like this.

As seen on page 3, the plan is to complete the Canadian channel, all in Canadian waters, with a low-water depth of 21 feet and a minimum width of 600 feet.

Again, on page 3, he says:

Approximate estimates of the amount of excavation indicate that the cost of this plan would be from one and three-fourths to two millions of dollars.

He further says:

This channel would continue to be wholly in Canadian waters, and its construction would probably be attended with some complications resulting from claims for damages by property owners on the main shore of Canada in the vicinity of Amherstburg, such action having been threatened in connection with operations heretofore undertaken in that locality.

Now, under these circumstances, should we proceed further? I submit that while there may be some question as to whether the Constitution follows the flag, which question will soon be solved in the court over here, that there ought not to be any question but what appropriations should follow the flag, and that appropriations should not be made by this Congress to build, maintain, or improve a channel in foreign soil or in foreign waters. I am for an American channel, for American boats, in American waters, on American soil. And this engineer must be right, too, in his position that this Government may be made to respond in heavy damages for building and enlarging this channel until it shall be 600 feet wide in Canadian waters and on Canadian soil. And what are these all for, anyhow? What great purpose or public benefit is to be subserved? This whole expenditure and the incurring of probable large damages is for the sole and only purpose of shortening the course for these great boats a few rods—a subsidy and benefit to a few large boat owners.

Let us look a little further. On page 4 Colonel Lydecker urges that Plan C, the American channel is not desirable. At the same time he says:

It is proposed to make further surveys during the present season and submit full and final reports, with detailed plans and estimates, in time for consideration when the subject may be taken up by Congress at its next session.

Now my amendments only require that this appropriation shall not be available until this preliminary survey has been made, and it is found that the Canadian channel is the proper one.

A further report was made, December 3 last, by the Secretary of War, found in House Document No. 82. On page 2 it is stated that—

To have a deep-water channel on the west of Grosse Isle the cost would probably be several millions of dollars. * * * But this question will be further discussed in a more full and complete report that will probably be submitted for consideration during the next session of Congress.

So it will be again seen that this is still a guess. His opinion is based upon the report of Assistant Engineers Dixon and Muehle.

On page 3 of his report it is stated that the channel and general conditions are shown on the lake-survey chart, but a note at the bottom says this was not printed. This, too, indicates that the proper information is not yet before Congress to guide it right in

determining the matter. So let us await, with patience, the coming of all needed information before we act. This is all I at present ask.

The opinion of Engineer Muehle, who does not live in Canada, and has no property there, who is unprejudiced, is decidedly at variance with the opinion of Assistant Engineer Dixon, as will be seen on page 5 of the report. He says:

Vessels coming from Lake Erie may approach the Wyandotte wharves by passing to the west of Mama Judy light-house and rounding the head of Grosse Isle, thus adding about 2 miles to the distance between the main channel and Wyandotte. Large freighters are not willing to lose the time required to cover these extra 2 miles in order to either leave or take up part loads of freight on route through the Detroit River; hence all materials for the shipyards (over 9,000 tons during the season) have to be taken to Detroit and reship from there to Wyandotte, and the Michigan Alkali Company can not make any satisfactory or profitable arrangements for shipping by water.

Yet this fair man, this unprejudiced man, who was moved in some degree in sympathy for the shippers of Trenton and Wyandotte, who are at the mercy of one railroad, only spent one day in his investigation of a project which it is estimated will cost several millions of dollars, for he says in his report:

On the 18th instant I visited Wyandotte and Trenton, Mich., and interviewed Mr. M. R. Bacon, manager of the Michigan Alkali Company, which operates two large chemical works, one at the upper and the other at the lower end of the city of Wyandotte. Both are located along the shore of the Detroit River and have superior facilities for shipping by water, yet the company is compelled to receive and ship nearly all materials and the products of their factories by rail, owing to the absence of a convenient and direct connection between the main channel of the Detroit River and the channel on the west side of Grosse Isle, along which the growing cities of Wyandotte and Trenton are situated.

If there were a deep-water channel between the Canada Southern Railroad bridge and Lake Erie, the commerce of the cities of Wyandotte and Trenton would be materially benefited. But in view of the absence of any prospect of securing, in the near future, such desirable southern outlet, an appropriate substitute is suggested in the letter of Mr. Bacon, October 3, 1900, viz, dredging a channel across the head of Grosse Isle, opposite the shipyard, thus furnishing the shortest possible connection between the main channel of the river and the docks at Wyandotte. Hence any improvements of the channel of the Detroit River on the west side of Grosse Isle in the vicinity of the cities of Wyandotte and Trenton, having in view convenient approaches from north and south or direct connections with the main channel, may be deemed worthy of favorable consideration by the Government on account of an extensive and growing commerce to be benefited.

So it will be seen that this man, while he did not make any surveys or measurements or plats or plans, did actually visit the vicinity and spend therein some part of one day—one short October day—and that he stayed there long enough to form an opinion that the commerce originating at and coming to Wyandotte and Trenton should have some consideration and relief, and to learn the fact that large freighters would not turn out of their course to get this freight, and to suggest Mr. Bacon's plan to at least cut across the north point of the island and afford some relief to shippers at these points. He seems to have felt that he was going beyond his instructions; that he was not talking by the card; that he was finding out things and saying things he was not sent to find out and say; for he says in the same report:

I am aware that the discussion of a scheme of this kind is not a proper subject within the scope of this report, etc.

Now, the testimony of this witness gives a faint glimpse of what may be learned from the engineers and from actual plans, diagrams, and measurements made by competent, unprejudiced, and unrestrained engineers.

And therefore I again urge that this appropriation shall not be available until such testimony is before Congress for its right guidance.

The American channel was used at this point from the beginning of the history of navigation, certainly as far back as 1835, continuously and almost exclusively until 1874, when a project was conceived to excavate a channel through the Rock Reef at Limekiln Crossing, and of deepening a section of the river above it known as the Ballards Reef section. No report of what was done was made until 1896, and therefore I assume that this rocky passage was not much used. Up to June 30, 1899, \$793,110.41 had been expended to provide a channel 144 feet wide and 20 feet deep. When this work commenced the original depth was scant 13 feet.

We are entitled to have the channel on the American side, where it was until 1893, and to have American laborers build it.

Mr. Chairman, God forbid that we should have any serious war or trouble with England, with Canada; but if this dire calamity should come to us, I appeal to gentlemen to contemplate our disadvantage—suppose that Michigan should be attacked at any point at or above Detroit, how would our battle ships get through this rocky Canadian channel? For a few hundred dollars this rocky channel could be strung with explosives, and we could be absolutely prevented from passing through. I ask if we should, in the language of the late Bill Nye, put our head in the lion's blasphemous smile?

This American channel was good enough for thirty years and subserved every purpose, and it is good enough now. There were three extensive shipyards at Trenton in those days, and Trenton was a thriving, progressive place. By nature she would have

held her place. The channel there was nearly 17 feet at the shallowest place and nearly a thousand feet in width, and by perverting the course of nature the trade and the prosperity which naturally belongs to Trenton has passed over to the Canadian side. And I raise my voice in protest against this injustice.

Mr. Chairman, the other part of my amendment, too, is just and right. If we were to expend millions of money to build a waterway for these large boats, then they should be made to serve the people who have shipments to make. This engineer, Muehle, reports that these large freighters are unwilling to go out of their course to get the freight which originates at Wyandotte. Suppose it is a little inconvenient, still they can reap large profit. I was told by the man who built one of these large freighters, and she was among the smaller ones, costing only \$230,000, and yet she cleared a net profit last season of over \$76,000. I am also told that such a boat under ordinary circumstances will last over fifty years. Thus it will be seen that such an amendment as I propose would not confiscate the property of these boat owners.

Now, Mr. Chairman, under all these circumstances, I submit that it is our plain duty to adopt these amendments, which I hope to present at the proper time.

I yield back the balance of my time to my colleague [Mr. Bishop], who kindly gave me time, for which I thank him.

River and Harbor Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. M. H. GLYNN,

OF NEW YORK.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, January 15, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. GLYNN said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I rise, sir, not to address myself in a general way upon this river and harbor bill, but to speak specifically upon some phases of the improvement to the Hudson River, in which the people of my district are commonly interested. No little pleasure has been mine, sir, as I sat in my seat during the past few days and listened to ridicule and irony heaped upon the merits and claims of river after river mentioned in this bill, and noted that none of my colleagues belittled the claims and merits of "our beautiful Hudson," though two of them sitting near me now, sir, are whispering to me, in the parlance of a popular song, that the Hudson "is getting more than is coming to it."

Were it not, sir, that these same two croakers at my elbow here are friends of mine and a little disgruntled because no money is appropriated to Skunk Creek in the district of one, and not a cent to Muskrat Pond in the district of the other, I would call upon them to entertain this House with the delightful minstrel performance of drawing a deadly parallel between their streams, upon whose waters no boats float save those of boys who sail toy ships at the end of a string, and the Hudson, which is a vast estuary of the Atlantic Ocean, rather than a mere flow of purling waters or an outlet of mountain rivulets.

It may be, sir, that my friends here have forgotten the geography of their schoolboy days, and if this be their sad condition I gladly remind them that the immense Mississippi of which they have talked so verbosely the last few days, even at the great cities of St. Louis and New Orleans, looks insignificant when compared with the Hudson at the small settlements of Tarrytown and Haverstraw. And, sir, if those Congressmen who make all-embracing claims for the Mississippi would but turn back the pages of history they would find that Hendrick Hudson's trip up the Hudson was but prophetic of its future. He was looking for a route to the Pacific.

True, he did not find it, but he did find the only pass in the Blue Ridge through which tide water ebbs and flows—for, men of the West, your studies in geology must have taught you that the highlands of the Hudson are the eastern portals to the valley of the Mississippi, and that the Hudson points its index finger toward the West in commerce as well as in geological formation. Every other route to the banks of the Mississippi has mountains from 1,000 to 2,000 feet to climb. But through the valley of the Hudson lies a natural highway, which Governor Clinton, of New York, completed by overcoming a few feet of grade to the level of Lake Erie above Niagara, and which will be further completed some day in the near future by the construction of a ship canal.

The importance, sirs, of the Hudson River as a great waterway

of commerce will be reflected in its naked truth when you remember, members of this House, that it absorbs all the traffic of the Erie, Champlain, and Delaware and Hudson canals, besides the great coal trade of the Pennsylvania Coal Company at Newburgh and the Erie coal trade at Piermont. Why, sirs, the local commerce of the Hudson River in 1897 was 3,682,864 tons; in 1898 it was 4,045,895 tons; in 1899 it was 5,070,800 tons; and in addition to this local commerce it carries each year a through commerce of not less than 10,000,000 tons. That it is also a great avenue of travel is shown by the fact that in 1899 it carried 1,278,000 passengers.

In the face of these facts and figures, is it any wonder that this bill carries an item of \$200,000 for continuing the work of improvement? It would be a matter of greater wonderment if it carried any less sum, and it will be a matter of still greater wonderment if this House should refuse to pass this appropriation. To my mind the sum ought to be more than \$200,000; and if any efforts of mine can bring it about, an additional sum for improvements in the Hudson will be tacked on some other appropriation bill passed by this House during this session.

In a plea for the Missouri River one of the gentlemen from Missouri has glowingly pictured the beauties of that stream. If beauty has any weight for an appropriation in this debate, I would like to remind this House that in his story of the Virginians Thackeray gives the verdict of beauty to the Hudson over the Rhine, and that in one of his essays George William Curtis, in speaking of the Hudson, says:

The Danube has in parts glimpses of such grandeur. The Elbe has sometimes such delicately pencilled effects. But no European river is so lordly in its bearing, none flows in such state to the sea, as the Hudson.

In a scientific sense, too, sirs, has the Hudson its claim upon this House, for it was through its waters that the first steamboat on this side of the Atlantic ever furrowed its way. Inasmuch as the esthetic has come to the front in this debate and a place has been given to beauty and science, we may as well go the gentleman from Missouri a point or two better and take in literature and history.

All students know that there is no stream in the United States around which poetry and romance so strangely blend with the heroic and the historic as they do around the Hudson; no river where the waves of civilization have left so many waifs upon its banks. From its birth in the Adirondacks to its marriage with the sea at New York Bay the Hudson River is a stretch of classic ground, sirs. It is the poet's corner of this country, the author's paradise, the inventor's inspiration, the artist's source of soul—the home of Morris, Willis, and Evans; the home of Field, Fulton, and Morse; the home of Church, Cole, and Audubon.

Of early historic lore the Hudson has a wealth. It is needless to state here that at the beginning of the Revolution New York was already among the foremost seaports, and the Hudson Valley the most populous and important highway to the interior north of the Delaware, and had an especial strategic value from the fact that it furnished a direct water route between the southern seacoast and the English strongholds in Canada. Its possession, therefore, was of vital importance to the American patriots since, if they lost it, New England would be separated by the enemy from the southern colonies.

During the whole war a struggle for the possession of the Hudson went on, and many of the most thrilling and important operations of both armies were conducted in this valley, beginning with the capture of Forts Ticonderoga and Crown Point in May, 1775, and continuing down to the defeat of Burgoyne at Saratoga in October, 1777, and the treason of Arnold linked with arrest and execution of Andre in 1780. So, sirs, if intangible accessories to rivers are to be listened to in this debate, you should hearken carefully to the eloquent words of utility, of commerce, of travel, of literature, of beauty, and of history for a constant improvement and a careful guardianship of the interests of the Hudson River.

These general remarks, sirs, but pave the way to the special target of my aim in this speech. As it is the duty of this Government to foster the advantages of its great waterways for commerce, so comes it as a corollary to this duty that it is an obligation upon the Government to prevent these avenues of commerce from becoming at any time a menace to property and a destroyer of life. The force of this contention has been recognized by this Government in its construction of levees along the Mississippi, and in its efforts to keep other rivers from jumping their banks and spreading devastation in the course of their wild cavortings in realms where they belongeth not.

What I intend to ask, sirs, is that this principle be applied in a mild way to the Hudson at Albany. Nowhere in this bill is there any clause seeking to put an end to the wholesale destruction of property at the capital city of the Empire State which has been caused for years by the Hudson when its waters are swollen and turgid. Almost impossible is it to count the thousands and thousands of dollars' worth of property destroyed there last spring

and the spring before by the waters of the Hudson inundating the lower portion of the business part of the city.

I know that some may contend that the Government can not stop freshets. No, I know it can not; but I do know that this Government is just as much under obligations to try to harness and check such performances on the part of the Hudson as it is to do the same thing along the Mississippi. Albany is entitled, sirs, to as much consideration as any city on the banks of that great Western waterway, and its property just as much deserving of protection.

When things come to such a pass that a river so overjumps its banks as to tie up the street railways of a city, to deprive it of electric lighting, and to transform a portion of its business locality into a second Venice it is time for the Government to step in and try and put an end to such a condition of affairs. And, sirs, this duty becomes doubly imperative when the pilings which the Government has placed in certain parts of the river to protect the channel contribute in a more or less degree to the effects which bring about these annual floodings.

There is something wrong somewhere that causes this destruction of property, and it seems but fair that the Government should take some steps to find this wrong and to right it. This is all I ask, Mr. Speaker, and at the proper time I intend to have offered an amendment to this bill, ordering a preliminary examination from Troy to Coeymans, with a view of finding a plan to prevent this wholesale destruction of property at Albany, and I trust the amendment will prevail. Last session I received assurances from official sources that such an examination, with this purpose in view, would be made.

But, sirs, so important is this matter that I think it justifiable to make assurance doubly sure, and so I plead with you to make my amendment an organic part of this bill. Justice asks that you should do this. The spirit of a fair field to all and special favors to none demands that you do this for the Hudson at Albany as a miniature reflection of what you have done in a larger way for other rivers with threatened cities on their banks. The voice of progress, always pleading for every movement to protect property, begs you to vote for this amendment and the good work which it proposes.

The examination asked for by this amendment will cost the Government but little. If it discloses that nothing can be done to better affairs, all well and good, as what can not be cured must be endured. But I hold that an examination will disclose that the Government can put an end to this destruction of property at a very small expense, and for that reason I trust the amendment will be adopted wherein this House authorizes the examination to be made.

Last session, Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to work for an appropriation of \$400,000 for the Hudson River, and the excellent manner in which that money was spent for the benefit of commerce is ably shown in the report of the competent and conservative Chief of Engineers. That the \$200,000 appropriated by this bill will be as advantageously expended for the interests of the Government needs no assurance to anyone familiar with the able men who preside over the work done on that river.

And now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me pay a little tribute to that grand river that I and all in my part of the country love so well, and surely such a tribute is not out of place in a discussion of the river and harbor bill. The Hudson has been well treated by this Government in appropriations for improvements, but no better than its commercial worth and its manifold claims deserve. The Hudson, sir, is a noble threshold to a great continent.

In varied grandeur and sublimity it has no peer among the rivers of the world. Alongside of its beauty, sunrises on the Bay of Naples and sunset at the Golden Gate of San Francisco lose their luster and their charm. Strip the banks of the Rhine of their castles and there is no comparison between the two rivers. Why, sir, from Dusseldorf to Mannheim the Rhine is only thirteen or fourteen hundred feet wide, while the Hudson from New York to Albany averages more than 5,000 feet from bank to bank. At Tappan Sea the Hudson is ten times as wide as the Rhine at any point above Cologne. At Bonn the Rhine is barely one-third of a mile, whereas the Hudson at Haverstraw Bay is over 4 miles in width. Surely, such a river as this should at once be an object of care and devotion from this Government.

Other Congressmen have presented you with pictures and descriptions of their rivers. Let me give you two of the Hudson.

The first is by Willis, and runs back to the time when the days of chivalry were just giving way to the days of discovery:

Fancy Hendrick Hudson steering his little yacht, the *Haafve Maan*, for the first time through the Highlands of the Hudson. Imagine his anxiety for the channel forgotten, as he gazed up at the towering rocks and round the green shores, and onward past point and opening bend, miles away into the heart of the country; yet with no lessening of the glorious stream before him and no decrease of promise in the bold and luxuriant shores. Picture him lying at anchor below Newburg, with the dark pass of the Wey-Gat frowning behind him, the lofty and blue Catskills beyond, and the hillsides around covered with lords of the soil exhibiting only less wonder than friendliness.

The other picture, sirs, is more modern. It is that of an October day on the Hudson, by Talmage:

Along the river and up and down the sides of the great hills there was an indescribable mingling of gold and orange and crimson and saffron, now sobering into drab and maroon, now flaring up into solferino and scarlet. Here and there the trees looked as if their tips had blossomed into fire. In the morning light the forests seemed as if they had been transfigured, and in the evening hours they looked as if the sunset had burst and dropped upon the leaves. It seemed as if the sea of divine glory had dashed its surf to the top of the crags and it had come dripping down to the lowest leaf and deepest cavern.

The Catskills and the Palisades—tongue can not tell or pencil picture their beauties. What one can fail to say about them can be dreamed of when seen. If not seen, they can not be appreciated even in dreams. And, sirs, as the gentleman from Missouri fell back on a poet to tell about the glories of his river, I propose to give him a Roland for his Oliver, and let Oliver Wendell Holmes speak for—

THE HUDSON.

'Twas a vision of childhood that came with its dawn,
Ere the curtain that covered life's day-star was drawn;
The nurse told the tale when the shadows grew long,
And the mother's soft lullaby breathed it in song.

"There flows a fair stream by the hills of the West,"
She sang to her boy as he lay on her breast;
"Along its smooth margin thy fathers have played;
Beside its deep waters their ashes are laid."

I wandered afar from the land of my birth,
I saw the old rivers, renowned upon earth.
But fancy still painted that wide-flowing stream
With the many-hued pencil of infancy's dream.

I saw the green banks of the castle-crowned Rhine,
Where the grapes drink the moonlight and change it to wine;
I stood by the Avon, whose waves as they glide
Still whisper his glory who sleeps at their side;

But my heart would still yearn for the sound of the waves
That sing as they flow by my forefathers' graves.
If manhood yet honors my cheek with a tear,
I care not who sees it—no blush for it here!

Farewell to the deep-bosomed stream of the West!
I fling this loose blossom to float on its breast;
Nor let the dear love of its children grow cold
Till the channel is dry where its waters have rolled.

Is there Necessity for a Large Standing Army?

SPEECH

OF

HON. MARION BUTLER,

OF NORTH CAROLINA.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Wednesday, January 16, 1901.

The Senate having under consideration the bill (S. 4300) to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States—

Mr. BUTLER said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I had intended to discuss this bill in detail and at some length, but in view of the time that has already been consumed in discussion, the few remaining days of the session, and the large amount of business before us, I shall content myself with a brief statement of my views as to some of the most important features of the bill.

Nearly half of the discussion during the ten days we have had this bill before us has been on the details, minor details, of the bill. I shall not discuss any of those features; indeed, I shall not discuss any detail of the bill, because, no matter what the details of the bill may be, no matter what minor amendments may be offered and adopted or rejected, if the bill is to stand as it is the evident desire of the Administration to have it stand, there will be two serious and fundamental objections to it; and it is those, and those only, to which I intend to refer.

First, the making of a standing army of 100,000 men a permanent fixture; not only to take that many men from the walks of industry, to organize them, stand them up, drill them, and keep them doing nothing—and I hope always nothing, because their only existence, as they are trained to believe, is to shoot and to shoot other men—but also to make a fixed charge upon the taxpayers of this country not for one year, not for ten years, but for all time, thus occasioning a great expense which seems to me to be unnecessary. Besides, our institutions are not strengthened by the presence of a large standing army, but, on the other hand, it may be a menace.

The second objection, Mr. President, is the radical departure which is made here in clothing an executive officer with legislative power. This feature of the bill is more serious than the question of the expense and the size of the standing Army.

Now, to return, I am ready, as one Senator, to vote for just as large an army as the Administration will tell us it needs for the

present emergency or any emergency that may arise. As I stated nearly ten days ago on this floor, this bill could be passed in half an hour if the Administration would simply call upon Congress to provide for an army of any size that the Administration would say was necessary for the present emergency.

I have paid as close attention as I could to this debate, and I think I am correct when I say that up to this hour neither this Senate nor the country has been furnished with a single reason why the Administration wants a standing army of this size instead of a volunteer army. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has not given us this information. His report does not give us the information; in fact, there is nothing in the report but a plea for the canteen.

The members of the Military Committee who represent the Administration and who have spoken have not given us the information; no newspaper in the country representing the Administration has given us the information; and I say, Mr. President, that it is an unseemly thing for the Administration to put a measure of this kind before the American Senate and attempt to put it through by whip and spur, showing irritation and ill humor at any and all discussion, and yet refuse to give us one single reason why they desire a standing army of 100,000 soldiers.

There is not a Republican Senator on this floor but knows there is not a Senator here who would not join in making the vote unanimous to continue the present military establishment, which is 100,000 soldiers, for one year, for two years, for three years; or, if the Administration desire it, I would be willing, and I believe every other Senator would so vote, to continue it so long as the Philippine war continues.

But all of these overtures are rejected; and when we ask for some reason why they reject our proposition to give them all they need for the Philippine war or any other emergency near or threatened that they will point out, they refuse to do it and complain about our taking time to discuss the question and asking for information which they refuse to give.

The chairman of the committee [Mr. HAWLEY] now sits before me, and I repeat my statement, for I do not know whether he was in the Chamber when I made it before, that up to this hour not one single reason has been furnished to the Senate—it may have been furnished privately to some Senators; but I submit the Senate is entitled to it as a Senate—not one single reason has been furnished to the Senate why a standing army of 100,000 soldiers is desired, and why every overture to give the Administration as large a volunteer army as it needs is rejected. If the Senator can give one reason now, I will pause for an answer.

Mr. HAWLEY. The case is very well stated, and laboriously stated, by the President and the Secretary of War. We do not regard it as a permanent standing army at all. The longest enlistment is for three years, and, of course, Congress will be here next winter to do as it pleases with the whole concern.

Mr. BUTLER. Exactly; and that is why I object to legislating for longer than Congress can come together. I suppose, if the Senator is sincere in what he has just stated, he will accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], which provides that this Army shall last for three years, the length of the enlistments. What objection has the Senator to that amendment?

Mr. HAWLEY. That is provided for now. We can not make it last longer than three years.

Mr. BUTLER. But the Senator insists on keeping in this bill that the soldiers shall enlist and be reenlisted again without further legislation by Congress. Why not let Congress legislate again at the end of three years or four years or five years, when you can come here and tell us just what you want?

Mr. HAWLEY. The Congress does not require any permission from me or from you or from any of us to dispose of this whole thing in three years. It can do it, if it so desires, when it is in session next winter.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the sham—that is the dodge that we have been met with every time we have asked for some reason or for some information. We have been asked, "Can not you trust yourselves; can not you trust the President?" You can repeal this law when you get ready." That is the lamest excuse for passing an unwise law I have ever heard of. "It is unwise; we can not give any reason for it, but we must pass it, and if you do not like it you can repeal it at some time in the future." Why not give a reason for doing it?

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] is very wise in suggesting to the Senator from Connecticut not to attempt to give it. The Senator from Wisconsin knows that no satisfactory reason can be given, and that is the reason the policy has been adopted of sitting still and giving no reason when one has been asked for. I pause, if the chairman of the committee can give us a reason.

Mr. HAWLEY. A reason for what? Has not the Senator discovered that there are tens of thousands of men shooting at our flag and making war upon the United States, so that the raising of an army is absolutely necessary?

Mr. BUTLER. We have had that to occur before. So have other nations, and the testimony of every military expert in the world is that a volunteer army is the most effective to meet a rebellion or invasion. The history of the wars of the world shows that.

Mr. HAWLEY. Every solitary man in that army is a volunteer.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, why does not the Senator let us continue them as volunteers?

Mr. HAWLEY. They would not be volunteers if you voted to continue them.

Mr. BUTLER. Every man in the United States to-day is a soldier of the Republic—every man at the counter, in the workshop, at the desk, in every industry of life is a soldier of the Republic—and there is everything wrong when the Republic does not take them as soldiers when the services of soldiers are needed, and let them return to their industrial pursuits when war and danger are over. Whenever the flag is fired upon, whenever there is any attempt at invasion, there can be brought by the President upon the first flash of news over the wires a million, two million, three million soldiers, tramping to Washington, or wherever else the flag or the Constitution is in danger.

Mr. HAWLEY. And those men coming not knowing how to "shoulder arms," it would take months to make soldiers of them.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator says that, yet all history shows that whether volunteers know how to shoulder arms or not they know how to "double quick" and to shoot when liberty is at stake. All history has shown that they have been the fighting force in every great battle of the world, and peculiarly so whenever the fight and the struggle has been one for liberty. No soldier in a regular army will show the heroism on the field of battle, will risk as much and dare as much and suffer as much as will the volunteer soldier when he is fighting for liberty and independence or for the preservation of his own government.

Mr. President, there are times and there are purposes and there are uses to which soldiers can be put when the volunteer soldier does not measure up to the standard of the machine soldier. I do not want to believe that in a Republic there can be such a use for soldiers other than volunteer soldiers. Monarchies, despotisms, nations that go into the business of ruling by force, always need a standing army, because they can not rely upon volunteers to murder, plunder, and oppress.

I shall not surmise, I shall not charge that this army would ever be put to any such purpose, for I have no reason to believe it would; but, still, I am met with the condition of things to which I have referred, that when Congress stands ready to vote all the money and all the men that the President will ask us to vote we are told they do not want it; we are told that they want this standing army, and, I repeat, not a single reason has been given why we need this standing army in time of peace.

Mr. President, even if we are to go into the colonial business—if we are going to imitate Great Britain—I submit that we are starting out very extravagantly. Great Britain to-day has colonies embracing about 9,000,000 square miles, and yet her army on a peace footing costs less money than this army that we are now asked to raise will cost. This army will cost all the way from \$100,000,000 to \$160,000,000, as estimated by General Alger when he was Secretary of War and when the Army bill was before us heretofore.

If my memory serves me aright, the peace footing of Great Britain's army costs less than \$100,000,000 when she has to use them to police and guard 9,000,000 square miles of colonies and dependencies. We have only 119,000 square miles so far, that we call by the various names of dependencies, colonies, or possessions, yet we start out to appropriate more than \$100,000,000 to support a standing army of 100,000 men. If we are going to imitate Great Britain, let us imitate her in proportion. She has seventy-five times as many square miles of territory as we have.

Mr. President, three years ago we had a standing Army of 27,000 men. Was the liberty of this people in danger then? Was the American Government in peril then from dangers without or dangers within? Did anybody ever suggest three years ago that the safety of our institutions was trembling in the balance because we had only 27,000 men in the Regular Army? What has occurred in the three years to make it necessary to have that standing Army nearly four times as large? We surely should not do this thing unless there is some reason for it.

If there is a reason and a necessity for a standing army this big, then we ought to have it this big; and I, as one member of this body, stand ready to vote for it to be this big if there is any reason why it ought to be four times as large now as it was in 1897. No one will dare say that what has transpired since then makes it necessary to increase the Regular Army on a peace footing from 27,000 men to 100,000 men.

There is but one reason that anybody will dare to give why this Army should be increased at all, and that is the Philippine situation. That is the only one that has been referred to; it is the only reason advanced. If that is all, then let us legislate separately for

the Philippines; let us keep at home the standing Army of 27,000 or 30,000 men that we had in 1897, and let us raise a separate army, a volunteer army, a temporary army, an emergency army, and send it to the Philippines and keep it there so long as it ought to stay, or so long as the American people will submit for it to stay.

Mr. President, there are some persons in the Republican party who want information as much as I do and who have not obtained it. They have expressed themselves to that effect. In its issue of October 10, 1900, the Chicago Herald, which I think is an Administration paper—I do not read it regularly—but I think it is—

Mr. TELLER. Oh, yes; very strong.

Mr. BUTLER. That is my understanding. I hold in my hand an editorial from that paper, which shows that outside, regardless of party, there are many people inquiring and thinking about this strange proposition before us. This is what that paper says in a leading editorial in its first column:

It is difficult to see why Secretary Root should recommend a permanent Regular Army establishment of 100,000 men, as it is said he will do in his annual report, for, though such an army could not be construed as a menace of militarism in a country of seventy-five millions, it could hardly be regarded as a necessity.

That is raising the very question that I am raising. This editor, a friend of the Administration, a man in sympathy with it in everything, as a rule, who looks at everything through the Administration glasses, says in a leading editorial that, while he sees no danger of the ghost of militarism, he can not see the necessity for such an increased Army. That is the opinion of this intelligent editor who has read all that we have read and who has got all the information, I suppose, which has been furnished to us as a Senate.

That is the question I ask. Where is the necessity beyond providing for an emergency, which every Senator is ready to vote to meet? Continuing, the editor of the Herald says:

The need of professional soldiers on this continent is really reduced to almost nothing.

That sounds like old Abraham Lincoln—"the need of professional soldiers."

Mr. President, there comes an important point of difference between the patriotic soldier, who fights for his country and who is ready always to lay down his life in fighting for it, and the professional machine soldier. This editor realized the difference. He realized that the professional soldier is inferior and, besides, is a burden upon the back of the remainder of the people; that he is useless and expensive, if not dangerous. The editor says the need of professional soldiers is reduced to almost nothing.

Mr. President, when our people have traveled in Europe, when they have gone to those countries that are weighted down with great military establishments, it has been the proud boast of every patriotic American that if he were at home he could ride 3,000 miles, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and never see an American soldier, and have no need to see one.

Have conditions changed? There is some reason that this editor can not see, and that I can not see, for the professional soldier. You do not need the professional soldier in the Philippines; and if you do, you will need him only for a short time, it is to be hoped. But for whatever time you may need him Congress is ready to vote.

The editor proceeds:

Such a force as we had before the Spanish war began—

And that was 27,000 soldiers—

answered all domestic purposes.

Why? The editor of the Herald answers the question:

Because the instinct for law and order is so strong in the people and the respect for the Federal authority is so great that in any civil commotion where the State authority is exerted feebly the slightest showing of blue-coats is sufficient.

Mr. President, the safety of this Republic is the veneration for law and order which is implanted in the breast of every citizen. The element of our people who may have any sympathy for anarchy, for lawlessness, for disregard of the rights of others, is so small, so infinitesimal, that it does not affect the equation in this country. It is public sentiment; it is that spirit which every man has in him and is ready to enforce.

Mr. President, just look at the great spectacle of an election in this country; the Administration changing hands every four years, just as the people dictate. Is a soldier necessary? It is as peaceful and occasions as little jar to this great governmental fabric as the falling of the driven snow. It is that spirit and that sentiment which is the bulwark of this Government.

The time has not yet come, and I hope to God it never will come, when soldiers are necessary to preserve law and order in this country. Whenever we must have ourselves ruled by soldiers, then the Republic is gone.

The editor of the Herald continues:

The only question is whether as a nucleus for the volunteer organization of a great war it might not serve better if it were somewhat larger, but adding 10,000—

that is, from twenty-seven to thirty-seven thousand men. The editor there recognizes the increase made necessary by the number of coast-defense fortifications, and in sympathy with that argument and responsive to it—for it is one that has been made on this floor—he suggests simply an increase of the Army by 10,000, that being all that seemed to him necessary for that purpose.

Then he suggests further that we provide 40,000 soldiers for the Philippine Islands, to stay there as long as they may be needed. That is a Republican suggestion, and it is one that I heartily approve.

In conclusion, the editor says:

The permanent establishment of 100,000 is therefore beyond all probable requirements.

Mr. President, I regret to say it, but there seems to be a kind of sentiment that is under cover, but that is cropping out more and more while this bill is under discussion, of want of faith in or distrust of or indifference to the volunteer soldier.

All through this bill he has been discriminated against. When did the volunteer soldier lose his standing in America? He had not lost it when Abraham Lincoln was President. President Lincoln, in a speech discussing the possible or probable dangers to this Government, said:

At what point shall we expect the approach of danger? By what means shall we fortify against it?

Now listen. He did not suggest a hundred thousand soldiers as a standing army.

Shall we expect some trans-Atlantic military giant to step across the ocean and crush us at one blow? Never! All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio River, or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years.

At what point, then, is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring from amongst us; it can not come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide.

Mr. President, one of the most fertile ways of national suicide in the past has been, first, by raising large standing armies, loading the people with debt, and then taking power from the people and piling it up in the hands of an executive or a few. I think history will bear me out when I state that in those nations that have committed national suicide it has begun in that way, and that those have been the deepest and most subtle and most poisonous causes of national dissolution. If that is true, then should not we jealously guard any and every step in that direction, and if that is true should we not change this bill, because no one will deny that this bill is a step at least in that direction?

Not only did President Lincoln pay a high tribute to the volunteer soldier in his speech, but also in his messages to Congress in 1861. I hold in my hand a speech made by President McKinley before the Marquette Club, in Chicago, February 12, 1896. His speech was on Abraham Lincoln, and he quoted from Lincoln's message, in which he pays a high and magnificent tribute to the volunteer soldiers. President McKinley not only indorsed those utterances, not only indorsed what Lincoln said about the volunteer soldier being the safety of the Republic, but he said:

What a noble, self-sacrificing army of freemen he describes! The like of it mankind never saw before and will not look upon soon again.

It shows that up to 1896, the year President McKinley was first elected, he still held the views that Abraham Lincoln held; he believed the volunteer soldier was the finest soldier the world ever saw and all we need for the national defense of a republic like ours. It shows that he must think so now, unless he has been deceived or has changed his mind.

Then, if the President thinks that now, I wish to know on what hypothesis or on what reasoning we can be asked by the Administration to pass the pending bill. I indorse the sentiments expressed by President McKinley in 1896. I indorse those expressed by Abraham Lincoln. I think they are the sentiments of the great masses of the people of America. If those sentiments are sound, then this bill is not sound. If those sentiments are patriotic and American, then this bill is unnecessary, unpatriotic, and un-American.

Do we intend to keep the gates of Janus open all the time? We are told that even in pagan Rome they closed the gates in times of peace. Let us open wide the Army in times of war, but let us not keep that burden upon us in times of peace. Let us close the gates of the temple of Janus, and when we close them let us take off the expense. Let us remove these men from idleness. Let them return to the walks of industry. Let them become wealth producers. Let them stay in touch with the great throbbing heart of industrial humanity and keep close in touch with American citizenship and all that it means.

Mr. President, as to the other feature of this bill—and I call attention as I pass to the fact that no one has yet given any reason

for wanting the Army a hundred thousand in time of peace—why shall we put into the hands of the President a discretion to have this Army one size or the other? Why give to the President the power, without any cause or emergency or crisis or exigency being in sight, to double the Army practically at his will?

Senators say, "Oh, you can trust the President." We have trusted him. Congress is ready to trust him again. It is not a question of trust in the President. That is begging the question. It is child's talk. It is a flippant answer when a great principle is involved. It is an attempt to turn from a principle and make the issue a personal one.

What people ever showed more confidence in one man than Congress, with the approval of the people, showed when they put \$50,000,000, at the beginning of the Spanish war, in his hands, without a condition or a limitation? There was an emergency. We had to have some one to act. We put it into the hands of the Executive, but we did it for a specific purpose.

The Senator from Georgia doubts the constitutionality of it, but whether constitutional or not, there was no danger in it, but a necessity for it. It was not a bad precedent, and it was a patriotic thing to do. The President did not abuse that power. I do not say he would abuse this confidence, but I would oppose doing this thing if I knew he would not abuse it.

Mr. President, it has been said that the most perfect form of government ever devised is that of an absolute monarchy, and that it will so continue so long as the absolute monarch is a perfectly wise and a perfectly just man. I am inclined to believe it is true, I am inclined to think that no government could be more perfect, so far as concerns its effectiveness and the harmony of its workings and the justness of its results, than an absolute monarchy, so long as you have for a monarch the embodiment of all that is wise and good and just.

But would we be willing to-day to change our form of government and to establish an absolute monarchy, provided we had furnished to us on a silver platter the most ideal piece of perfection and justice and goodness in the shape of a man for a ruler that the world ever saw or that the Kingdom of Heaven will have hereafter?

No. We prefer to grow by the exercise of our own efforts, and to learn by our own experience and mistakes, if you please, and to let each failure be a stepping-stone on which to rise higher. That is the way a people grow. It is better to make mistakes and to grow than it is to be ruled scientifically and perfectly as subjects. It is because our forefathers thought just that thing that they established this form of government, and in establishing it they were rightly jealous of one-man power.

They were also jealous of the legislative power in the hands of Representatives. They desired to keep the Government close to the people and to keep the influence of the people acting constantly on it. We all have admitted for a hundred years that it was the wisest form of government that was ever evolved from human brain.

Experience has demonstrated it. Now, after we have grown to be a world power by jealously guarding every right kept in the hands of the legislature and the people, and preventing, as far as possible, any of it accumulating in the hands of the Executive, or the one-man power, it is deliberately proposed here in an Army bill, a place where the concentration of one-man power is more dangerous than anywhere else, that we shall abdicate the legislative functions halfway with the Executive and empower him to legislate to the extent of 50,000 soldiers.

But the Senator from Iowa, who is not now in his seat, rose and interrupted the Senator from Nebraska, and said: "The Constitution says that Congress shall provide the funds for the support of the Army. We have not delegated that power." I suppose the Senator from Iowa meant to say that if Congress had delegated the power to raise the means to support the Army, then it would have been unconstitutional and un-American and wrong.

I regret that the Senator is not in his seat, but I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that it is in the same sentence of the Constitution where those two powers of Congress are laid down—that we shall raise armies and support them. If it is unconstitutional to turn over to the President the power to raise the funds to support an army, it is unconstitutional to turn over to the President the power to raise the Army.

Besides, whenever we delegate to the President the power, in his discretion, to raise the Army 50,000, we are to all intents and purposes abdicating both the power to raise the Army and the power to provide for it, because the President makes a contract, he enlists these men, and of course Congress can not refuse to tax the people and raise the money. Congress simply acts as an agent of the President when the President notifies us: "I have increased this Army 50,000 men; the expense is so much; you must tax the people to furnish the money." And so Congress abdicates both of those powers. When it abdicates one, it is bound to abdicate both.

Mr. President, Congressmen are paid by the year. They are

supposed to be in the service of the Government all the time. They are in the service of the Government all the time. They are to represent the people all the time. It is no great hardship and no great danger to American institutions for the President to call Congress together as many times as he sees fit, provided the public interest or the public safety requires it. When an emergency arises, it is better for Congress to convene than it is for the President to have power to legislate to save Congress the necessity of meeting.

I have asked Senators to name some exigency outside of the Philippine situation which they were afraid would arise while Congress was away. No one has anything in mind. Nobody has suggested any other exigency. Then why not let Congress keep its legislative power, which it is sworn to exercise, and say to the President, "When you want us, call us together," which he will do.

Mr. President, this is an un-American thing to do. It reverses the policy of our Government. It is against the genius of our institutions to begin to pile up and invest around one man such extraordinary powers. If there were no objection in the Constitution, if it was constitutional, is it a wise thing to do? Is it good policy? Is it good statesmanship? I think we could try it on that issue, leaving the Constitution out, and it seems to me there could be no difference of opinion as to the verdict.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] stated the other day that there was no use to waste time in talking about a big standing Army, because, he said, the people had already passed upon that question and settled it. He said it had been passed upon in November. It is not my place to lecture or give advice to the Republican party, and I do not presume to do it to any party, but if there are Republicans who are suffering under the hallucination or the misapprehension, like the Senator from West Virginia, let me say to them that they do not read aright the result of the last election.

I know a little something about the last campaign; probably not so much as others, but I know a little something about the sentiment of the people in the different parts of the country, and I tell you now that I never heard a Republican speaker, when it was charged that his party was going to raise a standing Army of a hundred thousand soldiers, stand up and defend the proposition. Every single one of them denied it, and said the only purpose was to raise an army big enough to defend the flag and put down the rebellion, and that when the war was over the Army would be reduced—that they wanted it only for this emergency.

I venture to say that ninety-nine out of a hundred, if not every Republican speaker, from ocean to ocean, made that pledge and that statement from every stump in the last campaign. So you did not have the question of a standing army of a hundred thousand men in time of peace at issue; you would not have it as an issue; you would not let anybody charge it; you would not defend the proposition. You simply retorted with a statement which took your opponent off his feet, for he was bound to agree with you.

Mr. President, it is very easy for our Republican friends to fool themselves about the last campaign, if they think it decided many things that they are advocating. The last campaign was a peculiar one. The Republican party won, more on account of a peculiar combination of circumstances than it did upon the issues at stake. In fact, it was difficult to have them define any issue. When you charged them with imperialism, they denied it and said the whole question was whether or not we should get out of the Philippine Islands at once in disgrace, or whether we should stay there long enough to establish law and order and give those people a government.

The people voted with them on that. The Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] said in his speech the other day that as soon as this war was over it was the purpose to reduce the Army. I do not remember which Senator, but a distinguished Senator on the Republican side said the next day that he had no idea that the Army would ever be reduced, that we should always want a hundred thousand men; and when asked what for, he failed to say. So we are at a loss to know what our friends want now, as the people were at a loss to know in the last campaign.

But I wish to say this: There was one factor that contributed to the Republican success in the last campaign probably more than any other, and one for which the party took no credit and is entitled to none. What was that? They used the full-dinner-pail argument from ocean to ocean. They called the attention of the country to the fact that when Cleveland was President we had depression, hard times, and falling prices.

They then called attention to the fact that now the tendency of prices was up, that labor generally had employment, and that, generally speaking, times were good; and then they said: "Bryan and the Silver men told you four years ago we could not have prosperity without free silver, and you have not free silver and you have prosperity, and therefore Mr. Bryan is wrong." There is the Republican speech. It won.

There were many men who were ardent silver men in the cam-

paign four years ago who had their doubts, whose faith was shaken, and it was largely due to the fact that the speakers on the Bryan side did not meet the issues in many places. The fact is that the condition existing in the last campaign was proof of everything claimed by Mr. Bryan and those who favored more money in 1896. Instead of its being proof that they were wrong and a repudiation of the doctrine, it was a vindication of it.

But I think those on the Bryan side failed to make use properly of the facts, and the Republicans took advantage of the situation most skillfully. Four years ago you told the people on every stump that you did not want any more money. You said we had money enough. You said if you had any more money, it would get to be cheap money; and you said every laborer should have his dollar the dearest dollar in the world, so that it would buy the most.

You said, if anything, there was too much money now. I can hear you say it right now. I have on file the newspapers and your handbooks. We stood upon the other side and we said, "Prices will not stop falling until there is a greater volume of money." We said, "This idle labor will not get employment until there is a larger volume of money." We said that the volume of money had to increase with the increase of population and business for there to be permanent a condition of prosperity. That was our proposition in 1896, and you denied it.

Now, what was the condition in the last campaign? The volume of money in the country had increased. The volume was increased by the enormous output of gold, and it was increased probably more than the increase that would have come from the free and unlimited coinage of silver under normal conditions. It was the most abnormal output of gold that the world has ever seen.

Under the free coinage of gold it all went to the mints and went out into the veins and arteries of trade. It was so patent that President McKinley himself in his letter of acceptance, when congratulating the country upon its prosperity, incidentally referred to the fact that the volume of money had increased about \$6—I speak from memory—per capita. It was good money, too, though the quantity had increased, but no better than if the increase had been silver or greenbacks. Did you know you were going to have an increase of \$6 per capita when you established the gold standard? If you had pledged me that you knew it was coming and would continue, I would not have objected so seriously to the bill.

I am willing that every dollar in circulation shall be gold, provided there is enough of it. It will not be good, however, if there is not enough of it, for there will be falling in prices. There will be misery and hard times, and laborers will be out of employment, and everybody will suffer except the money changer and the man who speculates upon labor and its products.

The only way to have good money is to have not too much and not too little. It is to have its volume increase *pari passu* with the increase of population and business. I should be willing for it to be made out of any substance if I could have that made the law as irrevocable as the law of the Medes and Persians. Any country, which wants to have financial prosperity and a general condition of prosperity, that will guarantee justice to all people and all professions and all classes of society, should have such a law. That is what we contended for in 1896. That is the principle we contended for and the principle you denied; and the great output of gold proved the principle to be correct.

The quantitative theory is what we stand for. The quantitative theory was proven to be true by the output of gold and the increase of \$6 per capita. That, with the large amount of money put into circulation by the war, made prosperity. You would have had the same prosperity if the increase of the number of legal-tender dollars had come through free silver, if it had come through greenbacks, or if it had come through dollars made out of diamonds or platinum. I think it is foolish to waste 50 cents' worth of silver on which to print a dollar. I think it is twice as foolish to waste 200 cents' worth of gold on which to print a dollar.

But I would be willing to make terms with all that kind of cranks. I would be willing to yield to extravagance in the material used in order to get them to stand with me for a principle that would make us all prosperous in spite of even that much extravagance. We can afford to tax ourselves, to be that extravagant, to waste that much raw material, in order to have the principle established and to have it operative, that the amount of money shall increase with the increase of population and business, so as to preserve equity between the producer and consumer, between the lender and the borrower.

Now, you prospered and carried your campaign simply because accident proved that we were right—the accidental output of gold. You did not know it was coming when you passed your gold-standard bill, and you did not want it to come. If you had, you would not have passed the bill. There is not a man in America who voted intelligently for the gold-standard bill but what in his heart to-day is mad and disgusted and nervous about the large output of gold.

He wants to stop it, because what he wants is scarce money and scarcer money. He wants the base gold, and he wants that small,

He wants it so small that the amount of money of the country will have to be bank paper based on it, and then he himself and his son John want to control that paper money, and they want the great Government to abdicate in favor of them and let them say when prices shall rise and when prices shall fall. I can understand how a few men who want the Government to abdicate the sovereign function of issuing money to them would be willing to abdicate the power of raising an army to the President or even to this same gang of bankers.

It is just as logical to vote to abdicate one as the other, and therefore it does not surprise me when a man is willing to tie the hands of the Government and let a little clique of bankers say how much blood of the nation shall be in its veins that he should favor the abdication of power in this bill. If men can think that is patriotic and right, and that we should trust them, I do not see why they do not change the bill and vest this same power to raise an army in the same clique of bankers.

Now, Mr. President, in conclusion I simply want to repeat that there are just two questions, it seems to me, in this bill when everything else is decided, right or wrong. If they are adopted or rejected, these two great questions still stand up here.

First, what is the necessity for this Army? Tell us, and we will vote for it. We will vote for any number you want for the Philippines, but we do not want a great standing army in time of peace. It is expensive; it is unnecessary; it is undemocratic; it is un-American.

Second, we do not want to put into any man's hands—even President McKinley's, even Abraham Lincoln's, if he were living, or Thomas Jefferson's, if he were living, or George Washington's—powers that the framers of the Constitution said should never go into the hands of one man, but should be in the hands of the legislative branch of the Government. It is not safe; it is not necessary, even if the Constitution was not in the way. Pray, tell me why we should do it? Is it good policy?

But they tell us we can repeal this law when we want to. Do you know how much more difficult it is to repeal a law when once you get it on the statute book? The Senator from Connecticut, chairman of the committee, made a parting remark as he left the Chamber, and his last word was that you can repeal it next year if you want to. You have got to get the House to agree; you have got to get the Senate to agree; and then you have got to find in the chair a President who will not veto it. You have got to run the gantlet of the three branches, and if we have one branch of one party and the other of another they are at cross purposes, and probably politics and a little friction may cause them to disagree when they ought to agree.

Why do we want to put ourselves in that condition when it is unnecessary? If any Senator could show me why it is not always feasible for Congress to legislate whenever it is necessary to raise the Army larger than the peace footing; if he will show me that the Government is in danger; if he will show me that our interests anywhere will suffer; if he will show me that our flag anywhere can be dishonored, I then would be constrained to strain my conscience past the Constitution and vote for a measure of doubtful constitutionality, to say the least, as a matter of national safety.

When we ask this question, Mr. President, we are answered that we dillydally and kill time while our flag is being cut down by insurgents, and the word "treason" has been used, as Senators have said, here too often. There has been a studied effort to call attention from the Constitution and from these facts to the flag as an answer to argument. Who has a monopoly of the flag? I do not even object to the Republican party using it as a campaign emblem and calling it "flag day," while it may be of doubtful taste.

I am willing that every wheelbarrow in the country shall have the flag on it, and that everyone shall stick one in his hat and be proud of it. It belongs to all the people. But I want to know what is this purpose to attempt to stick up the flag as an abstraction, as an answer to the argument, to say it is disloyalty to the flag when a man seeks to discuss whether this is constitutional or that is constitutional?

The flag; what is it? Does the blue paint on the flag mean anything by itself? Does the red paint across it mean anything? It means no more by itself than if a streak of red paint were put on that carpet and a streak of blue paint here and a star there. That flag stands for something. When a patriotic American citizen looks upon it floating out over the breezes and his heart swells with pride and that peculiar patriotic thrill runs through his being from head to foot, what is it that causes that emotion?

Is it the paint? No; it is because that flag stands for the Declaration of Independence and the rights of man, as guaranteed by it and the Constitution. It is because the great bulwark of liberty included in those two documents is represented and typified by that piece of cloth with the paint and the stars upon it. Then talk of loyalty to the flag. That man is loyal to the flag who is loyal to the principles it stands for and waves for, and the man who spits upon those principles while he waves that flag is a traitor to it, if we have got any traitors.

I protest against this studied effort to separate the flag and what the flag stands for. Monarchs, tyrants, use a flag as an emblem of their power, but the flag stands for nothing but their tyranny. Our flag stands for the opposite, and no man is loyal to it who is not loyal to everything it stands for.

Now, Mr. President, those men who have been on this floor time and again charged with treason, it was when they were standing up and protecting and defending the principles that the flag stands for as they understood it.

Mr. President, I repeat, let some one show us one reason for this army being this big in time of peace and I will vote for it. Let some one show that the flag and what it stands for and the national safety will be endangered unless we give the President this power, and I will vote for it. Until such a reason is given why should anybody vote for it? Why is it not a dangerous, a disloyal, unpatriotic, and un-American thing to do?

Naval Appropriation Bill.

SPEECHES

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. KING,

OF UTAH,

AND

HON. SYDNEY E. MUDD,

OF MARYLAND,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 24, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13705) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes—

Mr. KING said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I desire to ask the chairman of the committee whether these increases in clerks in the various departments and navy-yards are necessitated by the increase of business; and if not, what is the reason for increasing the business?

Mr. FOSS. I would state that it is entirely due to the increase of business.

Mr. KING. Does this bill merely provide for the regular force of clerks in the various navy-yards?

Mr. FOSS. Some of these are new clerks.

Mr. KING. Is there anything in the bill to indicate which are the old positions and which the new ones?

Mr. FOSS. Well, now, would the gentleman refer to any particular navy-yard?

Mr. KING. I notice here, for instance, the navy-yards at Portsmouth, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Norfolk.

Mr. FOSS. Now, take for instance, Portsmouth, one writer, at \$950.

Mr. KING. Is that a new office?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does the increase of business in the office justify the creation of a new office?

Mr. FOSS. Oh, yes; in all these yards there is additional business, owing to the fact that there are more ships to repair and more ships to equip.

Mr. KING. Will these new clerks that are provided for here be appointed from the classified service, or will the law in respect to the appointment of officials and officers be evaded, as it is constantly being evaded, by the higher officials and bureaus of the Government?

Mr. FOSS. Why, I understand that they will be appointed under the civil-service system.

Mr. KING. I desire to know from my friend whether it is a fact that in many of the Departments of the Government, including the War and Navy Departments, the present civil-service law is constantly being evaded, and persons are being placed in office and put into positions in direct contravention of the terms of the law?

Mr. FOSS. I am not aware of that fact.

Mr. KING. I want to ask my friend whether the offices created by this bill will be filled by appointment from the classified service, or will the bureaus and the heads of departments in the Navy Department have absolute and unrestricted power to make such selections as they please?

Mr. FOSS. I would say to the gentleman that this is the first time that I have heard a complaint of this kind. I suppose these persons will be appointed in accordance with law.

Mr. KING. My friend must know there are a great many complaints in regard to the present Administration—that it is constantly violating the terms of the civil-service law, and that the

violations have been so flagrant as to become a national scandal.

Mr. MUDD. I would like the gentleman to point out where there has been any violation of the civil-service laws in the Navy Department. I would be glad to find out where it is done.

Mr. KING. I think I can gratify my friend, but perhaps not at this moment, unless time is granted, as it would delay the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MUDD. I submit to the gentleman from Utah if he does not think it unfair to the Navy Department to say that these violations have become so flagrant as to amount to a public scandal without being able or willing to give a single instance of their occurrence.

Mr. KING. My friend when he proposes to quote a speaker ought to quote correctly.

Mr. MUDD. I tried to do so, and if I have not, I shall take pleasure in being corrected.

Mr. KING. I did not single out the Navy Department and make this charge against that Department specially. What I said, that the gentleman attempted to quote, was that the present Administration (not particularly the Navy Department) is guilty of a violation of the civil-service law, and that such violations are so constant and flagrant as to become a national scandal.

My friend from Maryland will remember the fact that under the pretense of the exigency caused by the Spanish war and the untrue statement that the civil-service list could not respond quickly to the alleged temporary requirements for additional clerks, hundreds of persons were appointed to positions, both in the War and Navy Departments, who never took the civil-service examination; and hundreds of such appointees, without examination, have been transferred to the classified service, still without examination, as I understand, and are now in snug positions for life.

Mr. MUDD. Has the gentleman finished?

Mr. KING. I think I have answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. MUDD. I want to know if the gentleman yields the floor, as I want two or three minutes in my own right?

Mr. KING. Yes, for the present.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say a word in reference to the statement made by the gentleman from Utah. I have never been accused of being an ultra civil-service reformer. [Laughter.] In fact, I have stood up whenever that matter was under discussion and manifested my desire for a modification of the system, even to the extent of voting to strike out the appropriation for the support of the commission in lieu of any other plan of expressing opposition to the system as it now stands or then stood; but I am unwilling to sit here silently and hear the Department, I am sure unintentionally, misrepresented. I have often heard charges about the violation of the civil-service law. I have heard them from my own constituents. Some of them have come to me here and wanted me to assist in the violation in order to get people into office.

Mr. WHEELER. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MUDD. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. I would like to know if the gentleman did not make an endeavor to assist his constituents? [Laughter.]

Mr. MUDD. No; I never made the endeavor in that manner. I am not much enamored of the law, but as long as it is on the statute book I am in favor of its being lived up to and obeyed. I am in favor of its enforcement in good faith as long as it is a law of the land. But, Mr. Chairman, I have taken occasion very frequently to make the inquiry as to whether or not these violations or evasions as charged by the gentleman have occurred, and I will say that after more numerous inquiries, I think, than have been made by any member of the House—because I take it that everybody knows from evidences that are visible around this Hall at all hours of the day that I have more applications for office than all the members of the House put together [laughter]—I have never found a single instance where that statement was borne out.

I am sure it would be less likely to be found in the Navy Department than any of the other Departments. The Secretary of the Navy, I am sure, not only favors absolute compliance with and obedience to the law in his Department and everywhere else, but further, as I understand—naturally it may be assumed from the environments and prevalent trend of thought of the locality from which he comes—is not only an advocate of but an enthusiast in regard to the merits of the civil-service law. I do not know that there has been any violation in the War Department. I have been able to secure one or two appointments there myself, and I wish I could have secured more, for the temporary list provided in the appropriation bills for clerkships during and following the Spanish war. I do not think the gentleman can point to a single instance in which a clerk in the unclassified service has been transferred to the classified service where he did not take the civil-service examination and place himself in the same category as an outsider.

Mr. KING. If I may be allowed to interrupt the gentleman, is it not a fact that immediately after the Spanish war there were added to the War Department and the Navy Department some one or two thousand clerks?

Mr. MUDD. That may be so.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact that a great many of these clerks have been placed in the classified service without having taken the civil-service examination?

Mr. MUDD. My answer is that I am aware that a number of such clerks have been placed there, but in the law which created them it is provided that as they were temporarily employed they should not be subjected to the civil-service examination. The law provided it, and there was nothing clandestine or irregular about it. I deny that any have been placed in the classified service without being subjected to the civil-service examination.

Mr. KING. Have they not been made permanent clerks now?

Mr. MUDD. No, sir; they have not.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact that most of these clerks were appointed for a temporary purpose during the continuance of the Spanish war and are still retained in the Department?

Mr. MUDD. They are still retained there, but their positions are not permanent. They are retained for the same service for which they were appointed, because we have not yet finished up the business growing out of the war.

Mr. KING. Does the gentleman mean to assert that none of the persons appointed for temporary purposes during the continuance of the war have been placed under the classified service without being subjected to the civil-service examination?

Mr. MUDD. I have stated that none have been placed in the classified service unless they were subjected to the same conditions and examinations as would be given an outsider. I do not think the gentleman from Utah ought to make these unqualified statements in the House as to the violation of the law unless he can name one single instance, and that he can not do.

Mr. KING. I will undertake to satisfy the gentleman that my statements are true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, it was not my purpose when I interrogated the chairman of the Naval Committee [Mr. Foss] concerning the manner of filling the offices created by the measure under consideration to precipitate a discussion of the civil-service law; nor would I now attempt to contribute anything to the subject were it not for the challenge of my friend from Maryland [Mr. MUDD]. In view of his statements I desire to submit a few observations, and also invite the attention of members to recent publications which fully support my contentions. The merits of civil service are not involved in this collateral inquiry. My specific charge is that this important law is constantly being violated, both in letter and in spirit, by President McKinley and the Executive Departments of the Government.

The purpose of the civil-service act is clear. After exhaustive consideration of the subject, it was determined that the merit system in appointments to political positions and offices under the Government should supersede the system under which the triumph of a political party was regarded as the commission to drive from office those of a different political faith, and to fill the same with ardent supporters of the victorious organization. If the merit system is good, it should be extended. If it is superior to the one against which it had to contend, it should crush the latter, and in the absence of something better should be firmly established and honestly administered.

The Republican party has indulged in loud and tumultuous praise of the civil-service law. It has pretended to be the stalwart defender and undaunted champion of the law. It has boasted of its fidelity to civil-service reform, and with solemn countenance Republican leaders have asseverated their determination to defend its advances and battle for its further extension. But an examination of the record of the Republican party conclusively establishes the fact that its love for civil service is all-consuming only when the Democrats are in power. When it is crowned with victory its boasted friendship is turned to bitter denunciation; it betrays the cause of civil-service reform, but, with lofty phrasing and hypocritical cant, it still affects devotion to that which it would cripple if not destroy.

In national convention in 1896 the Republican party declared in favor of the "merit system," and stated "not only that the law should be thoroughly and honestly enforced, but that it should be extended wherever practicable." Later, President McKinley, in his letter of acceptance, emphatically announced his approval of the party declaration. Notwithstanding this action, the cause of civil service has not only not been extended, but the present Administration has materially weakened it.

I doubt whether in the history of this Government, not forgetting the second Administration of President Grant, there has been such a wanton and unblushing disregard of law or propriety in the appointments and promotions to political and military positions as that which has been witnessed during the past three years and ten months. There can be no doubt but what the power of the President is far greater than was anticipated by the framers of the Constitution, and each year witnesses the assumption of

greater power by him. The patronage belonging to the Presidential office is enormous. Skillfully employed and partisanly used, it becomes corrupting and dangerous.

In the hands of a high-minded, patriotic President, the evils and dangers flowing from its exercise are reduced to a minimum; but in the hands of a weak and vacillating politician, or a partisan so blind as to see none but his supporters, its consequences can not be computed.

The Administration of President McKinley has been essentially one of "spoils." Never have the words "party service" and "pulls" been so significant. The candidate for political or military preferment reached the "promised land" if he had the "political pull." Those are magic words in this commercial, sordid, un-American Administration. It is time to be frank, at least with ourselves. We may endeavor to deceive other nations, and proclaim the transcendent virtues of our civil administration. We may with befitting gravity tell the Cubans we are in their island from disinterested and purely philanthropic and humanitarian purposes, to lead them to a higher civilization and teach them honesty in civic affairs, but neither they nor anyone else will believe us.

We know that the Administration is trying to steal Cuba, and that those for whom our hearts bleed when Spain's sovereignty extended over the island, those who were fighting for liberty, and for whose independence we were sincerely desirous, are now seditious, turbulent sans-culottes, incapable of self-government, and unworthy of independence. Why not tell the Cubans that we are holding their rich and fertile land, first, as a fruitful field in which Neely and Rathbone and other political favorites and beneficiaries of the "pull" can gather abundant harvests. There are so many patriots whose distinguished and wholly unselfish devotion to the country demand recognition that, if there are not enough offices at home to which they can be assigned, Cuba and other countries must prepare to be honored by providing high-salaried positions for these self-sacrificing patriots. And we should further tell them that our declaration, pledging the United States to withdraw from the island of Cuba, was intended to deceive the Cubans and the world; that our predetermined plan is to ultimately annex Cuba with or without the consent of her people.

Pretexts will not be wanting to justify the Administration in violating a solemn promise to withdraw from the island when pacification was assured. The obvious purpose of the Administration, in harmony with its record of extravagance, tyranny, and oppression, "loot and glory," is to impose such terms upon the Cubans, as a condition precedent to the withdrawal of the forces of the United States, that no self-respecting nation or people can accept.

The result will be the seizure of the island and its forcible annexation, if force is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, our nation is fast becoming a bureaucracy. Offices are multiplying and officials are increasing far in excess of the population or the needs of efficient administration. The vast political machinery committed to the care of the Executive makes him omnipotent. His power in the Government is too great to pursue a proper equipoise between the three branches.

Political victories are gained by barter and sale. Part of the consideration is that official positions shall be supplied to the myriads of political satellites, local bosses, and scheming principleless camp followers who infest the party and render questionable service in return for the promise of recognition when success to the party is assured.

Under such influences and party spirit and discipline the advancement of the merit system becomes an "iridescent dream." The wisdom of the system, its "theoretical" advantages, etc., are talked about; its beauties are extolled, but, it is then urged, the peculiar present conditions render its enforcement impracticable and unwise.

And so the power of the Executive is increased. He realizes the thunderbolts at his command and discharges them to confound his political opponents and strengthen his own and his party's position. He crushes opposition to his will and destroys the manhood and independence of national legislators and other high officials in the Government by the use of patronage.

Who does not know that the opposition to a large standing army, which has been a national characteristic, has been undermined and largely destroyed among many Republicans as well as a portion of the people of the country by the adroit and skillful distribution of thousands of commissions for military positions? Conquest and war and bloodshed are popularized by contracts for transports and ships and munitions of war, and the taking from the public Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars for distribution among the people.

No monarch on earth has such patronage as the President of the United States, and never has it been so employed for party advantage, for the insidious destruction of opposition to unwholesome and vicious and un-American policies, as during the incumbency of the present Executive. The ignoble treaty with Spain was predetermined by the President anterior to the selection of

the commissioners from this country. To commit to its support those whose voices were essential to its validity, selections were made of influential Senators. Representing the President, his views governed them. His work became in a measure their work. Thus they were committed to the ratification of the treaty. Of the methods employed to secure further support of the treaty which has brought so much of sorrow and woe to our land it is unnecessary, nor would time permit, that I should speak.

Mr. Chairman, the legislative branch of our Government is being stripped of its functions and power. Congress is now but the echo of the Executive. His will is its law. His desires, "uttered or unexpressed," drive brave men from high ground and rightful positions into servitude and senile sycophancy. There was a time when Congress was respected and was recognized as a coordinate branch of the Government. Under Republican rule, when Congress is not engaged in doing the bidding of the President, it is actively concerned in carrying out the wishes of the trusts and the money power.

The legislative department no longer initiates legislation or determines the policy of the Government.

It has completely abdicated its high mission. The President or the Executive Departments prepare the important measures, and by way of courtesy the legislative branch of the Government is permitted the gracious privilege of assenting to them.

The "President's policy!" These are words common to our ears in this Republican era. Congress has no right to have a policy. The people's representatives must have no policy. What matters it if the traditions of the past, which have brought glory and renown to our country, are violated by the President? We can not protest.

We have a new master—not the people, but the President. He declares war against the Philippines, not Congress. He declares for a colonial policy, for imperial prerogatives, for war, and a big army.

This is his policy, and consequently, under the new system of government, it is our policy. It is the "President's policy" to send commissioners to the Philippine Archipelago, invested by the President with powers arbitrary and despotic and in direct contravention of the provisions of the Federal Constitution; therefore this, it is said, is the "policy" of the American people. It is the "President's policy" to govern extraconstitutionally; to ascribe some vitality to the Constitution as it affects the 45 States, but to treat it as a nullity when he comes to deal with the territory of the United States, and the insular possessions, claimed to be a portion of the domain of the United States.

It is the "President's policy" to "haul down" the flag in Alaska; to negotiate a treaty with Great Britain concerning an isthmian canal which is at variance with accepted principles essential to our honor and security. And is it not the President's policy to regard with indifference the destruction of struggling republics in Africa, and with strenuous effort seek to prevent the establishment of a free republic in the Orient? This being accepted as the "President's policy," forthwith brave and patriotic American citizens, who were wont to speak out for the right, haul down the flag of their independence, capitulate without terms, not even asking for the retention of side arms, and soon are found wildly cheering as they follow the banners of the Executive.

It is the President's policy to impose upon the people of the United States a burden of nearly \$1,000,000,000 of taxation each year in order that militarism may be established, an unholy, unauthorized, and unconstitutional war may be prosecuted, political obligations be discharged, the rapacity of the trusts be appeased, subsidies and bounties granted, the simplicity of our republican institutions destroyed; and so with becoming modesty this is our policy.

And Senators and Congressmen—they crowd the Executive office, seeking with feverish anxiety the falling crumbs of patronage, sweeter by far to their hungry souls than was the manna so mercifully shed from the skies to the wandering Israelites in their dreary pilgrimage.

When will the wanderings of this Republic cease? Let us hope that the people will be aroused from their idolatrous worship of the fetish of modern Republicanism, and will turn from the apotheosis of physical power to the moral principles of righteousness and truth, and at last be crowned with peace and felicity in the "promised land" of a true Republic, the foundations of which were laid by our fathers' hands.

Mr. Chairman, it should be the purpose of every executive officer, and especially the Chief Executive, to have the highest degree of efficiency in all departments of the Government. "Public office" should be regarded as a "public trust," and only persons of character and probity should be selected for positions in the public service. In the administration of private affairs individuals seek for integrity and the elements of virtue in those whom they employ. If possible, a higher standard should be applied when choosing officials for public service. Upon the President devolves the responsibility of determining the character of public

servants. He can say that superior fitness for the position, honesty, and integrity shall be indispensable elements in every person selected.

He may, if he desires, encourage corrupt party organization, the triumph of the machine, and factional politics. The success of the civil-service law depends largely, if not almost wholly, upon the President. I wish to state to my friend from Maryland [Mr. Mudd] that all civic organizations interested in the preservation and extension of the merit system agree that the cause of civil service has had no encouragement from President McKinley. Upon the contrary, he has dealt it serious and staggering blows.

In support of the charge that the present Administration's attitude toward civil service has become a national scandal, I need only call attention to the matter of "reinstatements."

Favoritism, political "pulls," the payment of party obligations—these pernicious causes have secured the appointment, by reinstatement, of more than 40 per cent of the persons selected to fill vacancies in the Washington Departments during the past three years; and in this figure the Government Printing Office is not included.

In other words, though the civil-service law contemplates competitive examination, in order to secure fitness for position, which is by such law regarded as the *sine qua non*, more than 40 per cent of all vacancies in all of the Departments in Washington except the one above mentioned have been filled during the past three years by reinstating persons who were not connected with the service, and many of whom had severed their connection with the Government from five to fifteen years ago.

I believe the Civil Service Commission vigorously protested against this assault upon the law and this degradation of the system, but neither the President nor any of the Executive Departments paid the slightest attention to the protests.

It is known that there were hundreds of reinstatements by the Administration purely for political reasons. In order to do this the President, on May 28, 1899, so amended the civil-service rules as to permit reinstatement regardless of the time when persons were dismissed or discharged from the Government service. Under this provision persons who were dismissed years ago—many, doubtless, for good reasons—are now reinstated, and without examination. No doubt some of these were dropped because of the least competency. This order is a backward step; it was made for political reasons.

Another class of violations of the civil-service law is found in the constant practice, under this Administration, of making appointments to post-offices of nonresidents before classification, followed by transfer to classified positions after classification.

This pernicious and evasive course has especially been pursued when it was arranged to establish rural free delivery in a locality. So bold and defiant was the Post-Office Department in this matter that the Civil Service Commissioners were compelled to interpose.

In the Fifteenth Report of the Commission, pages 388-390, this subject is discussed. I desire to insert in my remarks what is said by the commissioners.

APPOINTMENTS TO POST-OFFICES OF NONRESIDENTS BEFORE CLASSIFICATION FOLLOWED BY TRANSFER TO CLASSIFIED POSITIONS AFTER CLASSIFICATION.

Early in 1898 appointments began to be made in post-offices on the eve of their classification, as the result of the establishment of free delivery therein, and the persons so appointed, almost immediately after the classification of such post-offices, transferred to other positions (usually of higher grade) in other portions of the Government service, sometimes in other Departments. Such persons were frequently not residents of the States in which the post-office to which appointment was made was situated. Since this practice subverted the intent of the civil-service act, the commission brought the matter to the attention of the Post-Office Department and requested its cooperation in abolishing such practice.

In a letter dated February 19, 1898, the First Assistant Postmaster-General stated:

"I have to say that, in compliance with your suggestion, it is the purpose of the Department in the future to confine appointments of persons at post-offices where the establishment of free delivery is contemplated to a period of not less than six weeks prior to the establishment, and the appointments to residents of the city in which the establishment of free delivery is to be made. Unless the emergency is great and necessity extreme, it is our determination to make no appointment at these offices earlier than sixty or ninety days, and, unless the nonresident has expert knowledge of the postal service and his especial abilities are required in the establishment, to refuse all applications for the appointment of others than residents of the city where the establishment is to be effected.

Instances of the abuse continuing to come under the notice of the commission, the matter was on November 7, 1898, and again on April 4, 1899, brought to the attention of the Postmaster-General in letters, in which the commission said:

The commission is in receipt of the Department's request, dated March 29, for the transfer of John Mahin, a clerk in the Webster City, Iowa, post-office, to the position of post-office inspector. Mr. Mahin was appointed to the post-office named on January 30, 1899, and the office was classified, as the result of the establishment of the free-delivery system therein, on February 1, 1899.

Transfers of this character are fast becoming common, and since in this practice inheres the power to cripple and even nullify the intent and purpose of the civil-service act—making appointment and promotion in the public service dependent solely upon fitness, as ascertained through competitive examinations, supplemented by a probationary period of service—it is deemed proper to again bring this matter to your attention.

The instances in which transfers of this character have been made appear on the inclosed sheet, headed "Transfers of persons from newly classified post-offices." The commission knows of no instance antedating that of R. M. Fulton, the first name appearing on the list, the certificate for whose transfer from the Cripple Creek, Colo., post-office to the position of post-office inspector is dated January 20, 1898.

As stated in the commission's first letter upon this subject, dated February 9, each of these cases involves an evasion of the spirit of the civil-service law and rules. In each case the person has been transferred to a position which he could not, under the rules, have entered except as the result of examination. Where employees are classified as the result of the extension of the operations of the civil-service act and rules it is assumed that they demonstrated their fitness for the positions they occupy, and an examination would therefore be unnecessary. It is manifest, however, that this can not be said of an appointee whose incumbency of an office is of but a few days' or weeks' duration.

In subsequent correspondence (see Department's letter of November 24, 1897, F-14720-W) it was stated that "it will be the uniform practice of this office to appoint only residents at new offices at which the civil-service examination had not been held or arranged for prior to November 5," etc. A number, however, of the persons mentioned in the attached list were appointed to positions in post-offices far distant from the State of their legal residence, and in the post-office at Newport News, Va., one of the offices which were the subject of the Department's letter of October 29, 1897, requesting that "only those who are bona fide residents of the cities to which the registers apply shall be certified," a legal resident of Tennessee was appointed.

This evil is not limited to the bounds of one Department, for, as seen in the cases of Messrs. Wasson, Jones, Clark, and others, transfer to another Department may be made under the provisions of civil-service Rule X. There is no limit to the number of persons who may enter the service in this manner. With the establishment of free delivery, at each new post-office a dozen or 50 persons might be brought into the classified civil service, to be transferred later to any vacancies that may arise in other portions of the service, and thus the purpose of the passage of the civil-service act—the improvement of the civil service by making entrance to positions therein depend solely upon fitness as ascertained through competitive examination—might be effectually thwarted.

The system of transfer embodied in the civil-service rules, when employed for the purpose for which it was instituted, is a valuable aid to the service. That it should be used to accomplish the defeat of the merit system of appointment to office was never contemplated by those who framed the civil-service rules. Yet this is precisely what the perversion of Rule X may accomplish.

Section 2 of the civil-service act states that the rules to be prepared are for the purpose of carrying the act into effect, and the most casual reading of the act shows that its primary object was to provide for the filling of all positions coming within its purview as the result of open competitive examinations, practical in their character, except where such positions are already filled by persons familiar with the duties thereof, and for whom an examination would be a superfluity.

Passing by without further comment the widespread possibilities for injury to the public service which this practice makes possible, this custom at the present time operates to defeat the purpose of the civil-service act and injure the Government service by—

1. Filling positions with persons who have not passed an examination prepared with reference to the needs of such positions.
2. Transferring to responsible supervisory positions elsewhere under the Department persons without training for such positions to the exclusion of persons possessing such training. This contrary to the Department's declaration that experience in the public service is essential to the proper discharge of the duties of such positions.
3. Transferring persons to positions in other Departments for which they have not passed the required competitive examination, and to which, in many cases, those already in such Departments should be promoted.
4. Discrediting the Department and this Commission in the eyes of the public by the appointment just prior to classification of post-offices of persons not even legal residents of the State in which the particular post-office is located, and at the same time objecting to the appointment of eligibles who are residents of the same county in which a post-office is located.
5. Defeating the reasonable rights of promotion of those in the classified service by first appointing an excessive number of persons in an office (without examination) and later filling vacancies in such service by the transfer of these persons.

Another notorious abuse has resulted from so-called "reduction of force"—the reduction would be immediately followed by new appointments. This palpable violation of the law has especially characterized the Internal-Revenue Department.

As an illustration of the high-handed and illegal course pursued, I desire to call the committee's attention to the internal-revenue office at Danville, Ky. July 1, 1897, President McKinley appointed a collector for this point. Within eighteen months thereafter, more than 90 per cent of the entire force of officials were taken from the service by the collector. He professed to abolish 91 offices or positions "for the purpose of reducing the force of the district to a number approximate to the requirements of the service."

Within a short time after dismissing these employees of the United States, this Republican appointee of President McKinley filled their places with Republicans. And my friend thinks I can not show violations of the civil-service law by the Republican Administration! Mr. Chairman, I could detain this committee for hours pointing out the wrongful, illegal, bold, criminal, and defiant conduct of the party in power respecting the civil-service law and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.

I will cite a few more examples, if the committee will indulge me. Many clerks have been promoted to post-office inspectorships without undergoing the examination prescribed by law. This violation of the law is referred to in the Fifteenth Report of the Civil Service Commission in the following language:

The clerks to the post-office inspectors at New York, Chicago, and San Francisco, having been promoted to post-office inspectorships without passing the required examination, the Commission, on December 14, 1898, wrote the Department as follows concerning these cases:

"The records of the Commission do not show that any of these persons have passed the examination for the position of post-office inspector, for which a

higher examination than that for clerks is required by the first proviso of paragraph 4 of Rule XI, which is as follows:

"That no promotion of a person shall be made, except upon examination provided by the Commission, from one class to another class or from one grade to another grade if for original entrance to said class or grade to which promotion is proposed there is required by these rules an examination involving essential tests different from or higher than those involved in the examination required for original entrance to the class or grade from which promotion is proposed."

"The examination for the position of post-office inspector involves tests that are both different from and higher than those involved in the examination for the position of clerk."

"In the rule relating to the examination required for transfers nearly the same language is used. It has been the practice of the Post-Office Department to request that noncompetitive examination be given for transfer of clerks in the Departments, in the Railway Mail Service, and in the Post-Office Service for transfer to the position of post-office inspector. It would have been consistent with this for the Department to have made request for noncompetitive examination for promotion of these persons. It is clearly apparent that the rules require that these persons be examined, and the commission would be pleased to make arrangements for examination of these persons at places convenient for them, upon receipt of instructions and the proper request."

No reply has been received to this letter, nor to a letter dated September 27, 1898, asking the authority for the appointment, without examination, of an assistant superintendent of free delivery at \$2,000 and a chief clerk at \$2,000, both in the office of the First Assistant Postmaster-General, the positions having previously been officially reported by the Department as included in the examination-required class.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a letter from the president of the commission, addressed to me, in which he speaks of the number of persons who have been brought into the classified service, in certain Departments, without examination. The President of the United States, in contravention of the eight fundamental principles and provisions of the civil-service rules, promulgated orders January 20, 1899, and May 29, 1899, the effect of which was to ignore the merit system and permit the appointment to the classified service of Republicans who never took the civil-service examination, and this though at the time there were more than 6,000 names of eligibles upon the civil-service list.

The president of the commission, in his letter to me, says:

Under the order of January 20, 1899, * * * affecting the Navy Department only, 134 persons were brought into the classified service without examination by this Commission.

Under the Presidential order of May 29, 1899, * * * there have been, up to December 31, 1900, brought into the classified service, without examination by this Commission, 1,032 persons.

He further states that of this number 627 were "temporary appointments in the War Department" and "were made owing to the exigencies of the war with Spain," and "which were afterwards made permanent." When my friend says that no "temporary appointments" growing out of the war with Spain have been made "permanent," he shows that he is not acquainted with the marvelous fidelity which his Republican Administration has shown toward civil service.

Another instance of a disregard of the law is referred to in the same report of the Commission on page 409:

PENSION EXAMINING SURGEONS.

In the Bureau of Pensions the practice of organizing, without precedent examination and certification, additional boards of pension examining surgeons in those cities where a classified civil-service board already existed, followed by the direction of all work connected with the medical examination of applicants for pension to the new board, has continued despite the repeated protests of the Commission to the Department of the Interior. The prior history of this matter, with the correspondence had by the Commission with the Department in relation thereto, appears in the Fourteenth Report at pages 349-355.

Mr. Chairman, I have here a number of publications, including the last reports of the Civil Service Commission. Their pages are filled with instances of the flagrant and arbitrary manner in which President McKinley and the Executive Departments of the Government have sought to defeat and destroy the operations of the law which he and others have sworn to uphold. Their perfidy and hypocrisy in this matter can not be extenuated.

I have not the time to further call the committee's attention to these publications, but I will print as a part of my remarks a statement recently issued by the National Civil Service Reform League, and also the report of the investigating committee of the same organization, which is printed in the January number of that patriotic and excellent journal which bears the significant title of "Good Government."

A perusal of these papers will convince even my friend from Maryland that all I have said about the evasions and flagrant violations of the civil-service law by the present Administration is true; and it will further demonstrate that the President, though appealed to again and again to uphold the law and redeem the pledges of his party and carry out his own promises, ignored the appeals and persisted in the illegal course.

OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE REFORM LEAGUE, 54 William Street, New York, June 5, 1899.

The following statement is issued in pursuance of action taken by the executive committee of the league at a meeting held Monday, May 29, 1899:

The National Civil Service Reform League, after mature consideration, regards the order of President McKinley, of May 29, changing the civil-service rules, as a backward step of the most pronounced character.

The order follows a long succession of violations of both the spirit and the literal terms of the law and rules in various branches of the service, and must be considered in its relations to these.

Its immediate effects, which have been understated, may be set forth as follows:

(1) It withdraws from the classified service not merely 3,000 or 4,000 offices and positions, but, as nearly as can now be estimated, 10,100. It removes 3,093 from the class of positions filled hitherto either through competitive examination or through an orderly practice of promotion, and it transfers 6,416 other positions in the War Department filled hitherto through a competitive registration system, under the control of the Civil Service Commission, to a system to be devised and placed in effect by the present Secretary of War.

(2) It declares regular at least 1,000 additional appointments made temporarily, without examination—in many cases in direct disregard of the law—in branches that are not affected by the exceptions, but that remain nominally competitive.

(3) It permits the permanent appointment of persons employed, without examination, for emergency purposes during the course of war with Spain, thus furnishing a standing list of many thousands from which positions in the War Department may be filled, without tests of fitness, for a long time to come.

(4) It alters the rule to the effect that in future any person appointed, with or without competitive examination, or without any examination, may be placed by transfer in any classified position without regard to the character or similarity of the employments interchanged and after noncompetitive examination only.

(5) It permits the reinstatement, within the discretion of the respective Department officer, of persons separated from the service at any previous time for any stated reason.

The effect of these changes in the body of the rules will be of a more serious nature than that of the absolute exceptions made. It will be practicable to fill competitive positions of every description either through arbitrary reinstatement, or through original appointment to a lower grade, or to an excepted position without tests of any sort, or even by transfer from the great emergency force of the War Department, to be followed in any such case by a mere "pass" examination.

As general experience has proven, the "pass" examinations, in the course of time, degenerate almost invariably into farce. It will be practicable also to restore to the service at the incoming of each new Administration those dismissed for any cause during the period of any Administration preceding. That such a practice will lead to wholesale political reprisals, and, coupled with the other provisions referred to, to the reestablishment on a large scale of the spoils system of rotation and favoritism can not be doubted.

The Republican party, at its last national convention, embodied in its platform the following declaration and pledge:

"The civil-service law was placed on the statute book by the Republican party, which has always sustained it, and we renew our repeated declarations that it shall be thoroughly and honestly enforced, and extended wherever practicable."

Mr. McKinley, in accepting the nomination of the party for the Presidency indorsed and reaffirmed that pledge in these words:

"The pledge of the Republican national convention that our civil-service laws 'shall be sustained and thoroughly and honestly enforced wherever practicable,' is in keeping with the position of the party for the past twenty-four years, and will be faithfully observed. Our opponents decry these reforms. They appear willing to abandon all the advantages gained after so many years' agitation and effort. They encourage a return to party favoritism, which both parties have often denounced, that experience has condemned, and that the people have repeatedly disapproved. The Republican party opposes this reactionary and entirely unjustifiable policy. It will take no backward step upon this question. It will seek to improve, but never degrade, the public service."

It must be said, though with profound regret, that the civil-service law as it stood at the date of the convention and at the time of Mr. McKinley's election, has not been "thoroughly and honestly enforced;" that conspicuous opportunities that have been offered for its extension "where practicable" have been rejected; and that, finally, by the personal action of the President steps are taken that undo much of the progress made in the past, and introduce a spirit into the service the influence of which can hardly fail to produce general demoralization.

To make plain the full significance of the situation a brief review of the past attitude of the Administration toward civil-service reform is required.

Congress, by an act of July last, exempted from classification all clerks and others to be employed for the war emergency purposes. This action was based on misrepresentations made on the floor of the House of Representatives respecting the resources of the Civil Service Commission. When it was shown later that the Commission was prepared to offer as many competent clerks as might be required at the shortest notice, the mistake was not corrected.

The Secretary of War, though left free to choose the method of selection, failed to call on the commission. Appointments for field service were made largely through the engineers and were legitimately of the emergency order. Those made by the Secretary directly were not. Many hundreds of these were made, without examination, to the exclusion of candidates regularly qualified and registered as such on the eligible lists of the commission.

At the succeeding session of Congress the Census bill was passed with a positive provision that the great force of clerks and statisticians to be appointed should be selected by the Director without competitive examination if he so chose and without the participation of the Civil Service Commission in any sense. This action had been preceded by a public discussion of the subject, and in the course of this it had been shown, in part by the statements of previous Directors, that the Census of 1890 had been rendered extravagantly costly and imperfect in consequence of the rejection of the competitive plan in organizing the Bureau at that time.

At the height of this discussion the President, in sending his annual message to Congress, urged the passage of the bill, but failed to recommend the application of the competitive merit rules in the manner that had been proposed. Thus the second opportunity to extend the system where plainly practicable was put aside. Neither have other extensions that might be effected by independent Executive action alone as yet been made.

The failure of the Administration to maintain the system as it existed has long been apparent. When President McKinley was inaugurated the revised civil-service rules of President Cleveland had been in operation for nearly a year.

To continue to give these rules effect in the branches newly classified the Civil Service Commission required, essentially, the cooperation of the appointing officers themselves. In many cases such cooperation was refused. In July of 1897 President McKinley promulgated an additional rule, the effect of which was that for the first time the reasons for removals were required to be stated in writing and an opportunity afforded the person concerned to make an explanation—an order which was very generally, and especially by this league, hailed with warm satisfaction as an evidence of his support of civil-service reform.

But in many important branches this rule, as well as those of earlier date governing appointments, was practically ignored. In the Internal Revenue Service and the Department of Justice, in certain bureaus of the Interior Department, in the Government Printing Office, and in many of the larger

post-offices and customs districts the rules in general were violated with impunity. In both these and other branches, moreover, various methods of circumventing the law were practiced, and many temporary appointments were made without examinations, to be followed frequently by the positive failure of the Department officers to aid in securing permanent appointees.

While in those branches of the service where the law has been longest in effect its observance continued to be satisfactory, the transgressions occurring in these others have been so numerous that an unfortunate tone has been given to the whole.

Respecting the Internal Revenue Service and the branches of the Department of Justice outside Washington, the claim was made that certain sections of the Revised Statutes warranted the setting aside of the civil-service law, although the latter was of subsequent enactment and practically all-embracing in its scope.

The fallacy of this contention was clearly shown by the Civil Service Commission in a published brief, and no written opinion in its support has at any time appeared. The violations of law, however, continued. In every part of the country subordinate officers, both in these two Departments and others, maintained a position of open rebellion against the authority of the President and treated the Executive orders with contempt. When an appeal was made by the Civil Service Commission to the Treasury Department to end this condition by declining to allow the payment of salary to persons holding positions illegally, the newly appointed Comptroller, Mr. Tracewell, of North Carolina, gave a remarkable opinion to the effect that the civil-service law had no force other than that given it by the Executive directly, and that whether persons were appointed in accordance with the law or not they must be paid their salaries unless the Executive, in each case, directed otherwise.

Letters were addressed to President McKinley by this league at various times, asking that the necessary steps be taken for the correction of the abuses developed and for the discipline of those officers directly responsible for them. Adequate corrective measures were not, however, taken, and so far as the league has been able to discover, in no case has an individual violator of the law been punished. Not only were these bad examples permitted to stand, but among the unclassified branches removals for avowedly political reasons were made sweepingly. A conspicuous example of this exists in the consular service, where 90 per cent of the salaried officers were changed.

The order that is now issued condones most, if not all, of the infractions of the law itself by removing the positions in question wholly from the competitive class, or by approving the appointments outright. To accomplish this it removes permanently from the competitive lists many positions and classes of positions for which, experience has shown, competition is not only practicable but peculiarly desirable and important.

During last autumn, when the scope of the order was in some degree anticipated, many protests were made to the President by organizations of citizens and by individuals. The protest of this league, submitted under date of October 23, was accompanied by a statement of the arguments against specific changes, arguments that have not as yet been refuted.

It was shown that in case of many of the positions in view Department officers who had fairly tried the merit plan had testified publicly to the successful results, and that for others on the list the Civil Service Commission had held some of the most satisfactory of its examinations. It was shown that officers accepting minor fiduciary positions may be required to furnish a bond in addition to the passage of an examination for appointment or promotion, as is already the practice in many of the most important branches of the classified service.

The speciousness of the claim that exceptions were necessary to permit unrestricted personal selections for positions of confidence or trust was shown by reference to the fact that where positions of this character had already been filled in violation of the law the appointees had been selected generally for political reasons only, not by the superior officer himself but by political agents, and in many cases with so little regard to fitness that the conduct of the public business had suffered in consequence. It was pointed out that the exemption of large classes of positions analogous in character to other classes remaining competitive would serve as a stimulus for fresh demands, and as a precedent for further concessions.

Beyond these considerations it was urged that a retrograde movement in the development in our administrative system would be peculiarly unfortunate and inopportune at a time when it is proposed to extend that system to distant dependencies and to offer the advantages of stable and competent civil service to other peoples.

These arguments, however, had little weight. The order is more comprehensive than had at any time been apprehended. It not only condones grave offenses and in so doing reduces materially the area of the competitive system, but it opens the way widely for practices that may make competitive examination in the future the exception rather than the rule.

It has been said in defense of the action taken that inasmuch as President Cleveland in May, 1896, extended the rules in such a manner that many of his appointees were "protected," and "partisan advantage" thereby gained, some correction of this sort was necessary; and, again, that the attempt to apply the rules in these cases had been attended by "embarrassing friction and delay."

It should be said in fairness to Mr. Cleveland that not a third of the offices classified by him on the date in question were of the class subject to frequent change, and that no person holding any of those was protected from removal on any grounds within the discretion or caprice of his superior officer. Until the order of President McKinley of July, 1897, was signed, the power of removal was practically unrestricted. This has been shown repeatedly, in the public press and on the floor of Congress; it should hardly require repetition.

It has been shown quite as clearly that the friction and delay to which reference has been made was due for the most part to outright opposition to the law on the part of officers whose duty it was to aid in its enforcement. If this were to be taken as a sufficient reason for exceptions it is to be feared that no class of positions whatever would be safe.

The argument in this particular is met completely in fact by the following testimony of the Civil Service Commission, contained in its recent annual report:

"The commission regrets to report that there has not at all times been that cooperation and effort on the part of some officials in carrying out the law and rules which are required by the statute. . . . It has been found that in all cases as soon as the officers in charge give unqualified support to the system and unite with the commission in its suitable and reasonable applications, little embarrassment or difficulty is experienced, and decided benefits to the service have been demonstrated almost from the beginning."

Although, for the first time since the passage of the Pendleton Act, important ground has been lost, it is hoped that the recovery of that ground will not long be delayed. The attempt made to take the "starch" out of the law in New York, with which this backward step is to be classed, has already resulted in a reaction that has placed the reform in that State in a more advanced position than ever before. The league expects, confidently, that the enlightened public opinion of the country, which of late years has so vigorously pronounced itself in favor of the development and extension of the merit system, will not only prevent the restoration of the spoil system in any

degree, but will rally for renewed efforts to carry the civil service reform movement to its final consummation.

GEORGE MCANENY, *Secretary.*

In enacting the civil-service law, in 1883, the committee shows, Congress intended that the system should ultimately embrace the entire subordinate Executive service, or, as the Senate committee declared in reporting the bill, "all that vast number of appointed officials who carry into effect the orders of the President . . . whose duties do not change with a change of Administration, and who have nothing to do with framing the political policies of the Government." Section 6 of the act made provision for a gradual extension of the system, through the action of the President and heads of Departments, until this end might be effected.

From the date of the passage of the act until May 29, 1899, this extension continued almost without interruption, each President making important additions to the classified list and strengthening the rules to guard against evasions. The latest of these additions had been in effect for about a year when the present Administration came into power, but by far the greater part of the work necessary to the completion of the reform remained to be done. With this fact in view the Republican party, at its convention in 1896, had "renewed its repeated declarations not only that the law should be thoroughly and honestly enforced, but that it should be extended wherever practicable."

The committee reports, however, that while in many of the branches that have been longest classified the system has been unimpaired and has continued to produce excellent results, it can not be said that the law has been "thoroughly and honestly enforced," while with the exception of the start made in the establishment of rules for the Philippines service, covered in a separate report to the league, conspicuous and unusual opportunities for its extension, where clearly "practicable," have deliberately been set aside.

The progress of the reform, in its application to the Federal service, has, in brief, been seriously checked. That this is at variance with the declared purposes of President McKinley, and with his professed wishes for the welfare of the service while under his control, is recognized and the committee earnestly recommends that the facts it submits be presented for the President's consideration.

On March 3, 1897, approximately 86,000 positions were in the classified service, while 92,000, including 5,000 Presidential officers, several thousand laborers, and other miscellaneous classes, and the great army of fourth-class postmasters, remained unclassified.

It might naturally have been expected that proper compliance with the law and recognition of its principles on the part of both Congress and the heads of Departments would, at this stage, have secured the appointment through competition of almost all the great number required for service in offices and positions of the sort that are classified. The committee, however, from the data it has at hand, reports surprisingly different results. During the first year following the order of May 29, 1896, that ended on June 1 last, the appointments made within these classes were as follows:

THROUGH COMPETITIVE TESTS.	
Appointments from competitive eligible lists	* 4,640
WITHOUT COMPETITIVE TESTS.	
Appointments to excepted positions, not subject to examination	254
Appointments to excepted positions, subject to noncompetitive examination	800
Appointments under "temporary" certificates	* 2,242
"Temporary" appointments made permanent without examination	973
Reinstatements without examination	1,170
Transfers of unexamined persons within the service	107
Unexamined persons having "special qualifications"	?
Appointments to clerical positions in the Departments under the war appropriation acts	1,200
Appointments to clerical positions in the Census Office	2,400
Total	9,153

These figures show that the "exceptions" from the requirements of the civil-service law, whether brought about through executive or legislative action, have been, during the year they cover, almost twice as numerous as appointments made in the manner the law intended. A certain proportion of the appointments so made were, no doubt, unavoidable, but these cases are exceptional and can not materially affect the totals given.

The committee gives the following summary of the general course of the Administration and of the present Congress in relation to the civil service, incidentally showing more clearly the significance of the above figures:

PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS.

I. So far as the committee has been able to learn, appointments of local Federal officers of the Presidential class have been controlled almost exclusively by Senators and Representatives or unofficial political leaders, whose selections the President has ratified. While good men are not infrequently secured through this system, in the majority of cases those appointed are active local politicians, whose disposition to provide places for their adherents furnishes a serious obstacle to the satisfactory administration of the civil-service rules at the outset. Among Presidential officers in the general branches—including business officers strictly, and not those that are properly political—the changes have been almost universal. In the consular service, for instance, more than 90 per cent of the salaried offices were refilled during the first year of the Administration, and in the Indian service, during the same period, 62 per cent of the agents.

CHANGES IN "EXCEPTED" POSITIONS.

II. Positions in the classified service excepted from competitive examinations are virtually unclassified, for removals may be made from them without restraint, and appointments are absolutely at the will of the appointing officer. The number of these positions has been greatly increased. On March 3, 1897, at the close of the preceding Administration, there were, all told, only 800, of which number 570 were of assistant postmasters. On July 27, 1897, President McKinley added 533, deputies and others in the customs and internal-revenue services, previously subject to competitive examination, and on May 29, 1899, approximately 4,000 more, in addition to the number removed absolutely from the classified service at that time.

VIOLATIONS IN COMPETITIVE POSITIONS.

III. As the classified service has grown it has been observed that violations of the civil-service law, both now and heretofore, have occurred most frequently in the branches most recently included. After the change of March 3, 1897, there were many irregular appointments in the classes brought under the rules a year or three years before, and not a few in branches longer established, coupled very frequently with irregular removals. These were mainly in the Internal Revenue Service, the Land Office service, the Government Printing Office, the field forces of the Department of Justice and the

* Full returns for last month of 1899 lacking.

Pension Bureau, and in certain of the custom-houses and post-offices—notably at the post-office in Philadelphia.

The Civil Service Commission addressed repeated protests to the Departments concerned in these violations, but in hardly an instance with satisfactory results. The records of their investigations, which the committee has examined carefully, cover 127 pages of their fourteenth report, 114 of the fifteenth, and 67 of the sixteenth. On September 17, 1897, the league addressed a letter directly to the President, inviting attention to the growing number of offenses, and asking that measures be taken to stop them. Where the rules had been most flagrantly disregarded, the dismissal of the guilty officer was urged, and the examples of this sort made by President Cleveland were cited.

On March 12, 1898, the league submitted a report showing the results of its investigations in the Philadelphia post-office, where, it was shown, the postmaster, Mr. Hicks, had removed many subordinates of known inefficiency because of their political or factional affiliations. On March 15, 1898, it presented to the President a general report on violations throughout the service, with exhibits, and again asked that the offending officers be dismissed.

In the great majority of cases, however, there was no correction, except in so far as appointments were nominally validated by the order of May 29, 1899. It is also true that no single officer has been removed for violation of the rules, although the rules themselves, in clearest terms, provide this penalty. The nearest approach to discipline of this sort was in the case of Chenoweth, collector of customs at Nogales, Ariz., who was caught in the theft of question papers in advance of an examination, as well as in other acts of dishonesty showing his unfitness for any trust.

Chenoweth was ordered to be removed by Secretary Gage. Through the apparent intervention of powerful influence, however, this order was withdrawn and a resignation accepted. The man is now serving, presumably not far from the American border at Nogales, as a "special agent of the Treasury Department, for confidential duty in a foreign country," at \$4 per day. This assignment is in itself a violation of the rules, against which the commission has protested, as yet without avail.

Although the President's order of July 27, 1897, seemed to furnish the first substantial check upon removals to be embodied in either the civil-service law or rules—an advance for which Mr. McKinley was most heartily commended at the time by the league—it was feared that through imperfect enforcement the value of this rule also would be greatly impaired, and experience has since shown that it has been.

EVASION OF THE RULES.

IV. While direct violations of the rules have been more or less common, indirect evasions have been more so. "Temporary appointments" are an instance in point. Under the rules persons may be appointed without examination for ninety days' temporary service, in the absence of an eligible list, for emergency work.

It is required that these shall be permitted only when the Civil Service Commission has given its certificate that there is no adequate list. In practice the vast majority of these appointments have been made at pleasure and without inquiry as to the state of the lists, continued indefinitely, and reported as long afterwards as the appointing officer chose. This practice, moreover, has grown alarmingly. During the thirteen months following the amended rules of May 6, 1896, 729 temporary appointments were authorized, and during the eleven months from June 1, 1897, to May 31, 1898, 2,365, of which not more than 80 were authorized by the commission in any manner. The figures do not include War Department appointments in either case.

In many instances appointing officers failed to assist the Civil Service Commission when called on in preparing examinations to secure permanent appointees, and in others, when lists were actually prepared, they have refused to appoint from them.

Another common method of evasion is the appointment of persons (generally women) as "laborers"—in which class examination is not required—and their assignment immediately to duties of a higher class. The growth of this practice the Commission frankly discusses in its fifteenth report. "Excepted" places are also used to bring persons surreptitiously into the competitive service, as in the San Francisco custom-house, where the principal deputy was made chief clerk, and the son of the collector appointed, without examination, to the vacancy, only to change places with the deputy when it came to the assignment of duties.

The Post-Office Department has adopted a device for evasion that the committee deems peculiarly reprehensible. When a small post-office is about to be given free delivery (which of itself brings the office force into the classified service), persons are brought from other cities, and even from other States, to take positions in such offices just before they enter the free-delivery class, to be transferred immediately afterwards to the office for which they are really destined, thus escaping examination altogether. Nearly a hundred appointments of this sort have already occurred, despite the earnest protest of the Civil Service Commission. Five of those so appointed (presumably without the least experience) have been transferred to the important and high-salaried office of post-office inspector, a proceeding which has been made easily possible by the change in the transfer rule contained in the President's order of May, 1899.

RESTRAINT ON IRREGULAR APPOINTMENTS DELIBERATELY REMOVED.

V. One of the most serious features of the situation is that, no matter how plainly or how frequently appointments may be made in violation of the law, the Civil Service Commission is powerless to prevent them. The commission may protest to the Department involved, or appeal from its decision to the President, but, failing to secure relief from either of these authorities, it is obliged to permit abuses to go unchecked. In the cities of New York and Chicago, and in almost every other place where a civil-service system has been established, fiscal officers are forbidden to pay salaries to persons whose appointment is not made in the manner the law prescribes.

The Federal commission assumed that the same rule applied, of necessity, at Washington, and three years ago asked the Secretary of the Treasury to aid it in establishing a proper system of audit. Failing to secure that officer's cooperation, lists of persons known to be illegally in office were sent to the Comptroller, Mr. Tracwell, with the request that their claims for salary be not recognized. The Comptroller declined to interfere, although the commission, under date of December 12, 1898, wrote to him: "A state of anarchy in these appointments obtains at the present time, involving the honor of the administration of the civil-service act. With the information given you by the commission, which is capable of easy verification in case of the slightest doubt concerning the facts, can you not take official cognizance of the matter?"

Mr. Tracwell did not answer this communication, but on April 1 following gave a remarkable opinion, addressed to a United States marshal, to the effect that even though the civil-service act declares that "no officer or clerk shall be appointed" to a classified position except in conformity with its terms, an appointment otherwise made is not illegal; that the civil-service rules have no force except such as the Executive or head of department chooses to give them, and that all persons whose names are on pay rolls presented to him will be assumed to be regularly appointed, the Civil Service Commission's denial notwithstanding. This decision, although directly opposed to rulings of the Supreme Court, is nevertheless binding so long as Mr. Tracwell himself remains undisturbed.

Its effect is disastrous, for though, as the statistics of the commission show, many appointments continue to be made in compliance with the law, the full number that are not so made, and that may never be reported, remains quite unknown and undeterminable. The two following ready instances show what can now be done: In the report of appointments in the Post-Office Department for June, 1899, there appeared the names of twenty-four persons under the head of "temporary clerks appointed under act of Congress approved February, 1899." The act in question merely gave the right to appoint, and did not exempt from civil-service examination. This was promptly explained to Assistant Postmaster-General Heath, but the letter remains unanswered, while the clerks are retained.

Again in the Treasury Department noncompetitive examinations are required, under the President's late order, for certain positions in the customs and internal-revenue services. Few of these have been held, but in cases where they have, and where the candidates have failed absolutely to secure the minimum of 70 per cent, qualifying them for appointment, they are still retained, their rejection by the commission notwithstanding.

THE "WAR EMERGENCY" APPOINTMENTS.

VI. On the plea that the Civil Service Commission had no means of meeting the emergencies growing out of the war with Spain, about 1,300 further appointments without examination were made in different Departments under special provisions in the war appropriation acts.

There is no means of securing exact figures, since these appointments have not been reported to the commission, and the league's request for access to the proper records in the Treasury Department has been denied. On August 1, 1899, however, the number was known to be at least 1,042. At the time of these appointments there were on the commission's list of eligibles 6,180 names, so that practically the entire force required might have been selected therefrom in two or three days. In the subsequent appropriation bills making provision for this force the exemption from examination has been invariably repeated, although the adequacy of the commission's machinery has been clearly explained to respective Congressional committees. Any clerk may now be appointed without examination if it is certified that "the necessity for his employment arises out of the war with Spain."

THE CENSUS FORCE.

VII. Although Mr. Carroll D. Wright, ad interim Director of the Census, informed Congress that more than \$3,000,000 had been added to the cost of the Tenth Census by reason of the failure to select the working force through the merit system, this system was again deliberately set aside in the taking of the present census, and, though the heads of bureaus have been efficient and well-trained men, otherwise the methods adopted in the former census, which proved such a costly failure, were followed almost exactly. The tests required, which were of the "pass" description, probably debarred the absolutely unfit, but the benefit of open competition was lost, and, as the process of selecting clerks and other subordinates continued, only persons endorsed by a Senator or Representative were considered at all.

THE ORDER OF MAY 29, 1899.

VIII. It was while the state of the service was as low as the committee declares that the President's order of May 29, 1899, was issued. That order and its effects are to be reviewed in a separate report. It is stated in connection with the present report, however, that it removed from the competitive to the "excepted" list about 4,000 places, and from the classified to the unclassified service about 6,000 more; that it validated, nominally, many appointments previously made in violation of the law, and weakened the rules governing transfers, reinstatements, and removals, so as to permit new and most serious abuses; and, finally, that it marked the first great reduction in the actual area of the merit system.

The committee presents this review of what it considers a very unfortunate situation, not only that the action of the President may be asked where he has the power to correct, but that every other necessary step may be taken to regain the ground that has been lost, and again to turn the direction of the reform toward the ends the framers and advocates of the civil-service law had in view. The committee will submit a number of specific recommendations for action on the part of the league.

Chicago Post-Office.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES R. MANN,
OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 31, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13729) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902—

Mr. MANN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The pending amendment practically involves the question of an increase in the salaries of clerks throughout the postal service, and especially in the large cities. That involves the question whether the present salaries paid to post-office employees in the large cities are fair and reasonable. I take it that no one will dispute the proposition that the Government ought to pay reasonable living salaries to its employees.

Postal employees are required to be quick of mind and active of body. They must be at all times on the alert when performing duty. A post-office clerk is required to be quick of brain, quick and accurate of eye, and speedy, accurate, and trained with his hands.

All of the mail matter in the cities passes through the hands of the distributing clerks. Many of the letters contain money, and it is often easy for both the clerks and the carriers to know or suspect that money is inclosed in particular letters. With temptations like these before them, it is to the interest of the service that steady and reliable men be employed. That means that, as a rule,

it is better for the service that the employees be married men. Such being the condition, the salaries of the postal clerks and letter carriers in the large cities ought to be large enough to enable a man in those cities to have a wife and to raise up a family of children.

In the Chicago post-office some of these clerks have been working for ten and twelve years, with good records, and yet their salaries to-day do not exceed seven or eight hundred dollars.

The average pay of distributing clerks in the Chicago post-office is less than the average pay of clerks (excepting stampers) in second-class post-offices, and this in spite of the fact that the cost of living in Chicago is much greater than the cost of living in smaller towns which have the second-class offices.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the difficulties in the way of increasing the salaries of postal employees. The railway mail clerks are asking for an increase. The letter carriers are asking for an increase. The postal clerks are asking for an increase. The fourth-class postmasters are asking for an increase in compensation. On the other hand, there is a considerable demand that the carrier service be introduced into smaller towns than is now provided by law. Rural free delivery is rapidly eating into the postal appropriations. Fast mail service by special subsidy is demanded in parts of the country. Pneumatic-tube service is being demanded by the large cities. And even without considering these various requests, the Post-Office Department is now run with a considerable deficit.

I remember, too, that the present annual postal deficit would be considerably increased if there were charged against it the cost of the General Post-Office Department in Washington and the cost of construction of the post-office buildings throughout the country, or rental upon the public buildings occupied by the post-offices.

But I insist, Mr. Chairman, that the Government has no right to permit in its employ half-paid laborers or employees. It is one of the strange inconsistencies that the hardest labor is often the poorest paid. Here in Washington the clerks in the Departments work six hours a day with labor that certainly can not be called hard, and yet they start in with higher salaries than the post-office clerks of Chicago receive after ten or twelve years' service. And this is so although the post-office clerks at Chicago are often compelled to work ten, twelve, and sometimes longer hours per day. The clerks in the Departments here, with their high pay and short hours, do not commence work before 9 o'clock and do not continue it after 4 o'clock in the daytime, while the Chicago post-office clerks have their rest and hours of sleep disturbed and broken into, and a large proportion of the postal work there is done after nightfall and continues until 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning.

When the present postmaster at Chicago, Hon. Charles U. Gordon, was appointed in 1897, there was a large number of clerks working in the Chicago post-office at \$400 per year, a trifle over a dollar a day. It is an offense to the human sense of justice to pay so poorly for the efficient work required of these clerks.

I contributed my assistance, with the other members of Congress then representing Chicago, to aid Mr. Gordon in having the lowest-paid clerks in the Chicago office raised to a salary of \$600. And I want to say right here, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion there is no man in the Government service to-day more able, efficient, and courteous than the gentleman who is at the head of the division of salaries and allowances in the Post-Office Department, Mr. George W. Beavers.

Under the necessary rules of this legislative body general legislation can not be enacted upon appropriation bills, and hence it is impossible for us, in the consideration of this appropriation bill, to insert any provision for the purpose of regulating and classifying the salaries of postal clerks, letter carriers, and railway mail clerks.

As I understand it, this bill increases by 200 the number of postal clerks receiving salaries of \$1,200, \$1,300, and \$1,400, which will result in the promotion of 200 clerks through all the grades below that of \$1,200.

This is good as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. No clerk who has been in the employ of the Government five years ought now to be receiving only \$700 per year. No clerk in a large city who has been in the employ of the Government for ten years ought to be receiving less than \$1,000 per year, and that is too small in many cases.

But, Mr. Chairman, while we have not been able to get before this House for consideration any of the bills for classifying, reclassifying, or increasing the salaries of the various postal officials, I would like to call the attention of the House to another proposition pending before it. This House has already set down as the next bill for consideration in regular order, subject to appropriation bills, conference reports, and Friday and Monday business, a bill which has for its object an increase in the salaries of revenue-cutter officers of 40 per cent and the retirement of such officers, after thirty years' service, at 75 per cent of their duty salary. This bill would retire 36 of the present 37 captains

of the Revenue-Cutter Service and give them a higher salary on the retired list than they now receive on the active list. That bill proposes to retire them for life on a salary of \$2,625 per annum, as against \$2,500 which they now receive on the active list. Yet these clerks in the post-offices may work harder than these captains do for ten, twenty, or thirty years, and at the end of that time receive a salary of only \$700 to \$1,000, or if, perchance, they are unable to longer perform their labor, they are turned out upon the street by the Government.

What justice is there in a proposition to increase the salaries of revenue-cutter officers to the extent of 40 per cent and retire them at the age of 53 or 54 upon a salary of \$2,625 a year, when the postal clerks and carriers in our post-offices for their onerous labor receive a paltry salary of less than two or three dollars per day? I say that if this House proposes to throw down the applications of the postal clerks and not increase their salaries from grade to grade it would be an unfair proposition to give favorable consideration to the application of officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service for an increase of 40 per cent in their salaries.

No postal clerk or carrier is asking for a 40 per cent increase. They are not asking to be retired on full pay for life. They would be satisfied at present with an increase of 10 per cent and with a gradual increase in the future, and it seems to me that their application is fair. It may be possible that I am biased somewhat by the fact that I reside in and represent in part a great city where there are a large number of these postal employees, but, Mr. Chairman, it is just that these men should be paid fair and reasonable salaries, and there is no comparison between the justice of their application for increased pay and the application of the revenue-cutter officers for a chance to be retired on higher pay for life than they now receive when working.

While I am talking on this subject I wish to say a word, Mr. Chairman, concerning substitute clerks. It is absolutely necessary, in a large city like Chicago, that there should be a considerable number of substitute clerks. Under existing law these clerks receive a salary of \$1 per year, and in addition the full salaries of the persons whose places they take for the time actually at work. These substitute clerks are required to report at the post-office every day, and sometimes twice a day. It is seldom that they earn so much as \$30 a month, not often that they get \$25 per month, and often do not get more than two days' work a week, at an average of \$2 per day, or \$16 per month. They are likely to remain on the substitute list for one or two years, and I ask the gentlemen here whether they believe it is fair for the Government to accept services such as is required in the Post-Office Department for \$16 per month. These substitutes can not take permanent employment elsewhere, because they are required to report every day and may be required to stay and work at any time when they report. They ought to be paid a fixed salary and be put on the regular list when first employed. The postmaster then might be given authority, during the busy days just before and during the holidays, to employ temporarily a number of additional clerks from the eligible list. Such provision as this would meet every emergency.

I know, Mr. Chairman, what the answer always is to this proposition. The answer is that the Post-Office Department is already running behind and that it can not afford to pay large salaries to its employees. The statement is constantly made here that if the Government paid fairly respectable salaries to the postal clerks, carriers, and railway mail clerks, with some regard for the services rendered, the postal deficit would be so large that no one would dare to face it. Mr. Chairman, in this connection I desire to call the attention of the House to the report recently submitted by the "Joint Commission to Investigate the Postal Service."

That commission consisted of eight of the ablest members of the House and Senate. Some of the information contained in the report ought to come with startling force to the members of Congress as well as to the country at large. This shows that the total loss to the Government by reason of the operation of the Post-Office Department for the ten years beginning in 1890 is \$110,000,000.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, the income of the Post-Office Department from first-class mail matter is stated to be \$65,987,732.98, and from second-class matter \$3,527,032.26. The second-class matter during that year amounted to 414,944,926 pounds. A portion of this second-class matter is carried free, and the balance pays postage at the rate of 1 cent per pound. Every pound of second-class matter is carried at a considerable loss to the Government.

In referring to this subject the joint commission, in their unanimous report, make the following statement:

It is estimated from the recent weighings that of the mail which was transported by the railroads (less equipment) 58 per cent was mail of the second class. The railway mail pay of that year was \$35,774,889.33, 58 per cent of which is \$20,749,435.81. Thus the Government paid in that year \$20,749,435.81 for the railway transportation of this class of mail from which the total income was \$3,527,032.26, a loss of \$17,222,403.55 on this account alone. Adding to this sum a fair proportion of the cost of the postal service, exclusive of railway mail pay, it is believed that the second-class matter alone costs the Government \$35,000,000 more per annum than it pays in postage.

So, Mr. Chairman, while the average loss to the Government during the last ten years on account of the operations of the Post-Office Department was \$11,000,000 per annum, the loss from second-class matter is \$35,000,000 a year. If, then, we abolish this loss on second-class matter the Post-Office Department, as now operated, will show a profit of \$24,000,000 a year.

I ask, is it fair for the Government, in the interest of private publishers, to make a loss of \$35,000,000 a year and then say to the postal employees that because of this loss it is impossible to pay them fair and living salaries?

We are hearing a great deal in these days about subsidies. A proposition to expend \$8,000,000 or \$9,000,000 a year as subsidies for the purpose of building up a merchant marine inspires a doubt in the minds of people generally, and excites the most bitter opposition of the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber. Almost all of our Democratic friends and many of the leading Republican statesmen and newspapers view with indignation and horror the propositions contained in the ship-subsidy bill. But here we go, year after year, depriving the postal service of needed facilities, keeping the postal employees on niggardly wages, in order that the Government may subsidize the newspaper press and the publishers of cheap and often vicious literature to the extent of \$35,000,000 a year.

When the Loud bill was up at the last session of this Congress for the purpose of, in part, correcting this abuse, most of the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber voted to retain this enormous \$35,000,000 subsidy to private publishers. In my judgment the subsidy in favor of second-class mail matter is one of the most serious evils existing to-day connected with the administration of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for the members of this House to realize the growth of postal business at Chicago. It is difficult for our own citizens at home to realize the growth of Chicago, but I hope I may be pardoned if I call attention to the business of the Chicago post-office.

The Chicago post-office was established on March 31, 1831, only seventy years ago, and Capt. Jonathan N. Bailey was the first postmaster. During his administration twelve letters a week were considered a heavy mail. The first post-office was located at the old Kinzie house, on the north side of the river, at the foot of Pine street. In 1832 the post-office was removed into a log cabin on South Water street near Franklin street. In 1836 the post-office was moved to No. 7 Clark street, and the total receipts for that year were \$2,148.29.

In 1837 Chicago became a distributing post-office, and a daily mail to the East was established. In 1844, 44 weekly mails were received and dispatched from the Chicago office. By 1846 the receipts of the office had grown to \$7,226.52 and the expenses to \$5,234. In 1850 the receipts were \$14,630, the expenses \$11,863, while the population of the city had increased to over 28,000.

In 1854 Postmaster Cook complained to the Department at Washington: "Our clerks are overworked. We have an insufficient force. Our space is too limited." These words have become familiar through constant use by every postmaster from that time to the present time, and there never has been a moment since the time when they were first used that they were not absolutely true.

The registry system was extended to Chicago on March 3, 1854. Free-delivery system was extended to Chicago in 1863. Money-order system was established and extended to Chicago in 1864. Railway Mail Service was established in 1865.

In 1890 the gross receipts at the office were \$3,142,203. The expenses were \$1,223,433. In 1893 there were employed 998 clerks and 935 carriers. In 1896 there were employed 1,267 clerks and 1,096 carriers. The Chicago office now has employed 1,516 regular clerks and 171 substitute clerks, besides 156 substation clerks located in drug stores, etc. There are 1,310 regular carriers and 230 substitute carriers. Besides the main post-office there are 46 postal stations throughout the city, which are in themselves separate post-offices, having clerks and letter carriers connected with them.

The total area of postal territory covered by the Chicago office is 190 square miles, over which is extended free delivery, and which is a larger area than is covered by any other post-office in the country, if not in the world.

During the first ten days of last October the average number of letters handled by the city mailing division was 1,800,000 per day. The weight of second-class matter for the same period was 1,650,349 pounds, or 825½ tons, an average of 82½ tons per day. During the same period third and fourth class mail matter (not including circular matter) amounted to 924,110 pounds, or 462 tons, an average of 92,411 pounds, or 46 tons, per day. In addition to this third-class matter, there were also handled 4,900 sacks of circular matter containing 3,477,300 pieces, or an average of 347,730 pieces per day.

The gross receipts of the office for the year 1900 were \$7,048,816, which was a gain of \$700,000 over the year 1899 and more than

double the receipts of 1890. During 1900 the Chicago office, in its mailing division, handled 80,568,881 pounds of mail. The second-class mail matter handled amounted to 53,028,065 pounds, representing 700 publications. The total number of letters registered during 1900 at Chicago was 4,980,361 as against 3,904,394 registered at New York; and Chicago registered one-twentieth of the total number of pieces registered in the United States. In the money-order division the transactions numbered 4,393,013, representing \$70,732,686. There were delivered 823,698 special-delivery letters.

As an example of the amount of business done at the Chicago office during the dull season, I give the number of mail pouches and sacks received and dispatched during the month of August last at the Chicago office:

Pouches of mail received.....	31,418
Dispatched.....	37,630
Sacks of mail received.....	117,273
Dispatched.....	210,033

Is it any wonder, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that with this rapid increase in business, from receipts of \$2,000 seventy years ago to over \$7,000,000 to-day, the Chicago office has been constantly and earnestly pleading for more help and for better-paid help?

Mr. Chairman, in addition to more help and to higher salaries for our present help, Chicago wants quicker service by the aid of the pneumatic tube. Of the over \$7,000,000 collected at the Chicago office last year \$4,500,000 was turned over to the Treasury of the United States by the Chicago postmaster. I do not claim that this \$4,500,000 is all profit. Most of it is properly chargeable against the cost of mail matter received at and dispatched from Chicago. But I do say that the postal business at Chicago was profitable to the Government; that there was some profit in it—probably one or two million dollars of clear profit. That being the case, I think that Chicago is entitled to have the salaries of her poorly paid postal employees raised, and at the same time to have the postal service expedited.

We have a city of immense proportions. We ought to be able to send letters through the pneumatic tube in an instant between the post-office and the railway stations and between the main post-office and the principal substations, especially the substations on the South Side at Twenty-second street, Thirty-first street, Union Stock Yards, Oakland, Hyde Park, and South Chicago. I know that the pneumatic tube service is yet in an experimental stage, and I am aware of the feeling in this House against continuing, at public expense, such a costly experiment; but I do hope, sirs, that you will give to the large cities of the country an opportunity to continue this experiment to the end that postal service may be quickened and greatly benefited. All parts of the country are interested in the postal service of the great cities, and the country, as well as the city, is interested to have the best postal service obtainable in the cities. [Applause.]

"There is that Scattereth, and yet Increaseth; and there is that Withholdeth More than is Meet, but it Tendeth to Poverty."

SPEECH

OF

HON. MARRIOTT BROSIUS,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, January 29, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 13801) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902.

Mr. BROSIUS said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No duty imposed by the Constitution upon Congress requires a more discriminating judgment and a more guarded discretion than the appropriation of money to defray the expenses of Government. Money supplies the motive power to the vast and complicated mechanism which performs all our Federal functions. The amount supplied, if wisely used, determines the effectiveness of every civil agency from the highest to the lowest. The end to be achieved is liberality without extravagance, economy without parsimony, disbursements commensurate with, without exceeding, the real needs of a growing country.

THE TRUE CRITERION.

In political administration, as in commercial business, inattention to the ratio of profit to investment is quite likely to lead to diminishing returns and consequent waste of capital. The true criterion of outlay, within the limits imposed by supply, is the amount that will yield returns in the form of public benefits commensurate with the expenditure. No man with any care for his country or any desire to minimize the burdens of the people

would consent to disbursements on lines of work which promise inadequate returns, and similarly no patriot would desire retrenchment in expenditures which would cripple the functions of any department of the Government and deprive the people of important public utilities greatly exceeding in value the money expended.

Due attention to these simple criteria will enable the House in the apportionment of the revenues among the various departments to be just to the people and at the same time generous to worthy objects of public support.

A comparison of present estimates with past appropriations is not a safe guide to present need. The Department is growing in usefulness and its wants are increasing. The only safe criterion is the intelligent judgment of this House on what is a proper sum, under present circumstances, to set apart for the support of that interest which lies at the foundation of our prosperity and power and the progressive development of which is necessary to maintain our deserved preeminence as the foremost agricultural nation in the world.

The Government, through the Agricultural Department, is rendering important aid to farmers. The money expended in carrying forward that work is a most economic expenditure. Julian Hawthorne, some years ago, stated that this was the only one of all the departments of the Government that returned regularly to the people money value far in excess of its cost. He likened it to a nickel-in-the-slot machine. Put a nickel in the "Department of Agriculture slot" and you pull out a dollar.

SCOPE OF ITS WORK.

The scope of the work embraces improvement in soil and modes of culture, protection to plant life, introduction of new plants for food and fiber, eradication of diseases of domestic animals, discovering utilities in products heretofore wasted, and in other manifold ways promoting diversification of employment and vastly increasing the productiveness of the farm.

The means of accomplishing results on these varied lines are the acquisition of the latest and best information on all subjects relating to agriculture by trained specialists; obtaining the conclusions of the latest science in whatever language it may be locked up; also, the results of the latest experiments wherever made, and the communication of this knowledge, boiled down and crystallized into nuggets of practical information, by printed bulletins and the public prints to the eagerly waiting farmers, thus enabling science to carry to every tiller of the soil a double blessing, widening his intellectual horizon, and, at the same time, multiplying his opportunities and enhancing his gains.

EXPERIMENT STATIONS.

The \$15,000 appropriated every year to each State for the use of experiment stations and the \$25,000 given to each agricultural college annually are gilt-edged investments. The four or five hundred specialists engaged in the work of investigation, scientific and experimental, that farmers may have from time to time the practical results of every new application of science to agriculture, earn their salaries many times over.

These specialists are working bees, winging their way to every land, sipping from every flower of science and experiment the honey they bring to the farmers' hives. The labor of disseminating the knowledge they gather is little understood. Some years there have been over 600 different publications issued, covering 25,000 printed pages, of which over 7,000,000 printed copies were distributed. In the last four years 38,000,000 copies of publications relating to agriculture were placed in the hands of farmers. In addition to this, a half million copies of the Yearbook, containing the garnered fruits of a year's scientific, historical, and practical information for farmers, were distributed.

THE NAVEL ORANGE.

In the Seed, Horticultural, Pomological, and Botanical divisions great results have been achieved. Nature seems to limp and stagger in her distribution of the fruits of the earth. She gave potatoes and corn to this continent; we gave them to the teeming populations of Europe. She gave the eucalyptus tree to Australia; we made it a boon to the treeless plains of Southern California. Apples and fruits of various kinds, trees, grasses, and vines have been imported from foreign lands to enrich the products of our soil. The most notable instance is the navel orange of California. It was first propagated in a hothouse in the Department of Agriculture. The cutting came from Brazil. That unrivaled fruit has been worth more to this country than the total costs of the Agricultural Department since its first establishment. An orange grower from California, visiting the Secretary of Agriculture, said he had raised his hat twice that day—once in honor of the author of his liberty and once in honor of the author of his fortune. In explanation he said he had raised his hat at the tomb of Washington, who was the author of his liberty; then he came to the hothouse of the Agricultural Department and raised it to the old orange tree imported from Brazil, the parent of all the navel-orange trees in this country, and to which he owed his fortune.

FIBER.

Grass and fiber afford striking illustrations of the value of the Government's work. It is expected that investigation and experiment at an early day will be rewarded by the successful production in our own country of fiber that will save us a large portion of the enormous sum paid for imported fiber for manufacturing purposes.

INSECT PESTS.

The Division of Entomology has done a noble work for the farmer. While we have been enriched by plants, fruits, and seeds from foreign lands, we have also been cursed by their insect pests. The Hessian fly, it is said, did us more harm than the Hessian soldiers. It was harder to dislodge. Washington could make the Hessian soldier fly, but all the power in America could not keep the fly out of the wheat. The study of the history of these insects and the means of checking their ravages, now going forward in the Department of Agriculture, may be worth millions to the farmers of this country.

Take, for example, the "scale insect," which well-nigh destroyed the orange industry of California. No instance can better illustrate how profitable are the exertions of the scientific expert and how rich are the rewards of scientific knowledge applied to agriculture. Information of these incursions was sent to the Department. The entomologist took up the study of the white-winged stranger. It was found that his native haunts were in Australia, where he had not been a pest. In this country, however, he multiplied with enormous rapidity. Science arrived at the conclusion that the difference between the insect in Australia and America was that in the former country it was kept down by a parasite, which did not accompany it to this country. Correspondence was opened with Australia, but the scientists of that country knew nothing of the parasite. The sleuthhounds of science connected with our Department of Agriculture pursued the hunt, sent an agent to Australia, found the parasite—"Vedalia cardinalis"—bagged it, brought it to this country, let it loose upon the infested trees, and witnessed the miracle of the destruction of the scale insect and an industry saved from ruin.

But there are more recent achievements than these. The annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture tells of the introduction from Africa of a parasite which preys on the olive scale, a pest of the California olive groves. Locusts have been inoculated with a fungous disease, introduced also from Africa, and the results of importing last year the insect which fertilizes the Smyrna fig are said to have been most gratifying. "In one locality in California more than 6 tons of Smyrna figs of the highest grade of excellence have been produced and packed." Previous to this no Smyrna figs had been produced in this country, but Secretary Wilson predicts that this insect "will make America a strong competitor in the dried-fig trade in the world's markets."

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] animadverted with some severity upon the Bureau of Animal Industry. I would like to refresh his recollection of the usefulness of that Bureau. A few years ago a terrible cattle scourge prevailed in many States of the Union, causing dismay and consternation among cattle growers throughout the country. Pleuro-pneumonia was widespread and alarmingly fatal. The Bureau of Animal Industry went swift-footed to the rescue. The Department reported that from August 1, 1886, to November 30, 1888, there were inspected by the agents of the Bureau 50,838 herds, containing 300,837 cattle. There were found 1,828 infected herds, which contained 5,715 infected animals, and there were made 49,073 post-mortem examinations. Wherever a herd was found infected it was at once quarantined and the infected animals slaughtered.

By the wisely directed efforts of the Bureau, guided by the highest attainable scientific skill, the dread disease was effectually stamped out. It is not known to exist now in more than two or three localities, and nowhere in virulent form. But it is a subtle and insidious disease, and the germs are hard to entirely extirpate, so that the greatest and most constant vigilance is required, as well as unceasing readiness to move upon it at any time in any section where it may break out.

Now, let me give you one other illustration:

TEXAS FEVER.

To the exertions of the Bureau is likewise due the rescue of our cattle from the malignant malady disseminated by Southern cattle known as "Texas fever." Anyone can see what a peril hangs over the cattle industry in this country when this malignant infection breaks out, especially along the lines of interstate commerce. The value of the protection to our herds and the destruction and loss prevented by the constant watchfulness of the Bureau and their promptitude in applying their remedies and enforcing their preventive regulations whenever a premonitory symptom appears is hardly within the range of calculation. It has been estimated that the restrictions on the movement of cattle from

State to State, made necessary by the prevalence of the contagion, cost the stock raisers of the country not less than \$10,000,000.

Similarly it has been said that the immunity of our stock yards from the Texas infection, under the regulations of the bureau, is worth \$20,000,000 a year to the cattle industry. And this can easily be understood when we remember that the Texas-fever district extends from the Maryland line on the Atlantic coast to the Rio Grande River, embracing in its sweep 11 States.

But the effectiveness of the work of the bureau is limited by the means supplied for its operation, and I know that the farmers of this country who realize the importance of efficient service on these remedial and preventive lines of work projected for their protection, if they were consulted, would declare with united acclaim for a liberal appropriation to keep this bureau at all times on an effective war footing.

WORK OF SPECIALISTS.

So in the investigation of diseases of plants, trees, and domestic animals the scientific experts, with an energy born of an earnest enthusiasm in their work, are tearing away the mask of mystery that has kept the secret of those scourges hidden from human intelligence while they preyed upon the farmer's gains.

No one can fail to see the importance to the farmer of the quests these specialists of the Agricultural Department are pursuing. They are seeking and, if sustained, will ultimately find answers to the questions, What is plant disease? What is pear blight, peach yellows, and black rot? What is vine disease, rust in wheat, potato rot, and mildew? What is hog cholera, swine plague, pleuropneumonia, Texas fever, tuberculosis, glanders, and horse distemper? When these questions are answered by science, millions will not measure the saving to the farmers of the country.

EXPERIMENTS.

Mr. Chairman, it is easily seen that farmers can not take the initiative in these necessary scientific experiments for two obvious reasons: First, their lack of scientific knowledge, and in the second place their inability to bear the losses incident to experiments conducted on an adequate scale to produce satisfactory results. The speculator may make enough in one successful deal to cover the losses of many an ill-starred venture; but the farmer's gains will not carry double. His losses from storm and drought and worm and beetle are all that he can bear. He can not speculate on the chances of drawing a first prize in the lottery of experiment; so that in order that farmers shall enjoy the benefits of the progress of science in its application to agriculture, and lessen as rapidly as possible the "hit or miss" character of farming, it is necessary for the Government not only to aid in the dissemination of knowledge, but to produce results itself at public expense, and thus be an agency in the advancement of scientific agriculture.

PENNSYLVANIA INTERESTS.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I come to a matter that I approach with great reluctance. In this bill there is a rearrangement and regrouping of divisions to some extent, with a view to greater efficiency, and some increase of salaries. It may be that this portion of the bill is subject to the point of order made by my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON], and if he insists, it will all have to go out, although it is obvious to anyone that it will greatly facilitate the work of the scientific divisions and redound immensely to the benefit of the farmers. To insist on that point of order seems like a deliberate blow at the interests of the tobacco growers in my district, as well as those in the district represented by my colleague who threatens to insist upon the point of order. I hope his second thought will be better than his first, and that mercy to his own constituents as well as mine will lead him to abandon his purpose.

Pennsylvania has appropriated for many years an average of 28,000 acres of her best land to the production of tobacco, producing an average of 30,000,000 pounds a year.

Lancaster County is producing about 15,000,000 pounds a year, the greatest leaf tobacco producing county in the Union, according to the census of 1890.

We import 7,000,000 pounds from Sumatra, at a cost of \$6,000,000, annually. Scientific investigation of soils and modes of culture in several States has revealed the fact that the production of Sumatra tobacco in our own country and the diversion of all this money to our own people is quite within the range of possibility if a little liberality is extended to the scientific service of the Agricultural Department in the pursuit of its scientific exertions in the investigations of soils and modes of culture and curing.

Pennsylvania has suffered severely from "black rot," a disease that is incident to the curing process. An improved method of fermentation will enable Pennsylvania and Ohio to produce a quality of tobacco equal to the Cuban product; but to do this we must have the services of scientific experts, who can only be secured by the payment of salaries in some degree commensurate

with the value of their work. We have lost some exceedingly valuable men recently because higher salaries were offered them elsewhere.

Now, when you consider that the tobacco industry in this country pays into the public revenues annually over \$50,000,000, it does not seem unreasonable to divert a small portion of that sum to the remuneration of services which may very greatly increase the industry and still more enhance the revenue derivable from it.

The tobacco produced at the experimental station in Connecticut sold at 71 cents a pound, while the ordinary product brings about 20 cents.

LIBERALITY IS TRUE ECONOMY.

This is but one of many instances which accentuate the enormous returns for the money expended in scientific experiments in soil and modes of culture. And yet there are those who object to the outlay necessary to keep the scientific bureaus of the Department of Agriculture in the highest state of efficiency. The man who buttoned his collar to a wart on the back of his neck to save the price of a collar button, and stopped his watch at night to save wear and tear, and tied lightning bugs to his bee hives so the bees could see to work at night was benevolence itself compared with a man who antagonizes these reasonable outlays for the benefit of millions of American farmers. If there is any lack of dignity in this illustration I will make the average right by quoting from a sacred writer a passage which I have often commended to those two-penny economists who habitually cavil at our appropriations for the Agricultural Department:

There is that scattereth and yet increaseth, and there is that withholdeth more than is meet and yet tendeth to poverty.

For years the tobacco producers of my district have striven to rescue their industry from the ravages of the Sumatran invasion. They are growing weary of raising fillers at from 2 to 8 cents a pound when they have a firm belief that a little liberality on the part of the Government in the line of scientific investigation of soil and modes of culture and curing would result in the production of a leaf of such a quality as would take the place of the Sumatran goods largely imported now for the manufacture of cigars for American consumption. In this view of the case it affects me with a poignant grief to see my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] constrained by a sense of duty to mutilate this appropriation bill by striking out that portion of it which gives my constituents a reasonable hope of having their industry redeemed from the ravages of this Asiatic invasion and the value of their product doubled and trebled by improvement in quality. Why there should be any desire on the part of an American statesman to play into the hands of the merchants of Amsterdam and the importers of the products of a Dutch monopoly to the injury of American farmers is not easily comprehended.

A hundred thousand men in Pennsylvania and other tobacco-producing States interested in this legislation are pleading for the scientific help that the specialists of the Agricultural Department could afford if we would give them the means of doing so, and they hold up to us the picture of a balance swinging between the nations, in one scale a Chinese cooly living on 10 cents a day, in the other an American farmer, and they wait with awed and wondering look to see in which scale their Representatives in Congress will place the weight of their influence.

TWO PROPOSITIONS.

Now, Mr. Chairman, without further detail, two propositions are demonstrably clear:

1. The objects to be attained through the instrumentality of the Agricultural Department are necessary to the safety and the progressive development of that great industry which underlies and upholds all others.

2. That no duty presses with greater urgency upon this Congress than that of supplying this Department with the necessary means of subserving the purposes of its creation, and keeping in effective operation its varied agencies, and carrying to successful execution its authorized regulations for giving effect to its exertions on all lines of legitimate work.

PROGRESS OF SCIENTIFIC AGRICULTURE.

Money increases in power and worth to this Department in proportion as scientific knowledge and experience widens its views and its operations approach scientific precision. The waste of experiment diminishes as the certitudes of science increase. Scientific agriculture is advancing with firm and steady step upon the outlying provinces hitherto given over to vexatious doubts and vain conjectures, and is annexing them one by one to the domain of uniform and stable results. The scattered truths of science are coming together and taking form. A splendid body of organized knowledge is emerging from the ignorance of the past and lighting up the farmer's horizon with a radiant promise of a brighter

day for the interests of agriculture. The farmer sees it, feels it, and knows it. He believes that the Government in some way can hasten the light of the coming morn. He is impatient, is reaching out for help, it may be a little blindly now, but he will right himself as he advances. The notions that are crude will give way to better ideas and he will at last stand on the firm rock of sound principles. Meanwhile the reaching hand should feel the touch of a helping palm and the listening ear be made glad by the throb of a sympathetic heart as far as the Government is able within wise and constitutional limits to realize these conditions.

Baltimore and Ohio Railroad.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. COWHERD,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 7, 1901.

The House having under consideration the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 229) to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings of railroads in the District of Columbia, to require and authorize the construction of new terminals and tracks for the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company in the city of Washington, and for other purposes—

Mr. COWHERD said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The House will understand that these are two bills providing for eliminating the grade crossings in the District of Columbia and the erection of depots at the terminals. This is the Baltimore and Ohio bill, in which we appropriate a million and a half dollars, and the other is the Pennsylvania, in which we appropriate 34 acres of public land. Though these are separate bills they always appear in the House at the same time in order that the friends of both may be rallied to their support. To use the expression coined recently by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Vest], they are yoked together by "an interdependent mutuality of greed." I insist, Mr. Speaker, as I have always insisted, that these appropriations of money and property ought not to be made; that they do not serve the public benefit, but are for private interests, but if the House is determined to make these appropriations, then I do insist, for the interest of the public, that we should see that there is provided here in the District of Columbia a union station, at which all roads may enter both now and hereafter. I want to say to some of the gentlemen from the Southern States, who support these measures, that if they are put through they are putting it in the power of one railroad company to shut off hereafter the opportunity for the Southern States to reach the nation's capital, or else to come in at the dictation of the road into whose hands the power is placed.

Mr. MUDD. May I interrupt the gentleman there?

Mr. COWHERD. Yes.

Mr. MUDD. Do I understand the gentleman to say that in these two railroad bills the city is voting 34 acres of land?

Mr. COWHERD. With what they now hold of public land, according to the report of Colonel Bingham, there are 34 acres in all given to the Pennsylvania Railroad.

Mr. MUDD. Does not the gentleman include in that the 25 acres that were originally reclaimed from the Potomac flats?

Mr. COWHERD. No; 14 acres in the Mall and 6½ acres in Garfield Park, in addition to the 5 they are now using, and some small reservations.

Mr. MUDD. The Commissioners state that there are only about 8 acres in all.

Mr. COWHERD. There are only about 8 acres of the Mall taken, because they are now using 6 acres. The 6 acres that they are using and 8 acres in addition make 14 taken out of the Mall.

Now, if these two bills are disagreed to, then, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the matter can be referred again to the committee, and the House will be then in possession of the entire matter; or, if I be wrong in that, the bills can be beaten, and the committee hereafter can be ordered to bring in a report giving to Washington a grand union terminal station, at which all roads may enter and at which other roads seeking entrance hereafter may be given permission to come in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when this matter was before the House the last time the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia made a statement which seemed to me had great weight with the House, and which, I wish to say, was entitled to great weight if it stated the facts. I think, however, the chairman was mistaken in regard to that, and I intend to prove, as far as in my power—and I think I have the proof here—that the chairman was

mistaken. I read from the RECORD, so that I may do him no injustice.

As a rule, the people of the District of Columbia are behind the proposition.

The gentleman was speaking in regard to the Baltimore and Potomac bill:

I would say that 90 out of 100 favor it; that the people and the taxpayers of the District unite in a consensus of opinion as to the desirability of this project.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the District of Columbia have no way to express their wishes to Congress except through civic associations that they may have formed. They have no way of voting upon these matters; they have no representative here to express their wishes. But they have formed all over the District various civic associations, and these associations are accustomed to present their wishes to Congress by resolution. I want to call the attention of the House to the expressed opinion of every civic association, so far as I have been able to find them, in the District of Columbia, and to show that every single one of these associations not only disagrees with the opinion of the chairman of our committee, but especially and emphatically protests against these bills.

The largest association, probably—I will not say the largest, but the most powerful association—of this character in Washington is the board of trade, consisting of 670 members, comprising in its membership nearly all the men who are known as the influential and leading citizens of Washington and the District of Columbia. The board of trade held a meeting and took up these bills after they had been referred to a committee, discussed them; and I am informed that the meeting was attended more largely than any other that the board of trade ever held. They passed resolutions upon this subject, and I want to call the attention of the chairman to the resolutions adopted at that time. I shall read only a part of the various resolutions which I hold, and shall ask to publish portions which I do not read.

Mr. BABCOCK. What was done with those resolutions after they were passed?

Mr. COWHERD. I do not know. I have been told that they were sent to the committee.

Mr. BABCOCK. I want to say to the gentleman that I have not seen any resolutions of that kind, nor have they been addressed to the committee in an official way. And further, I want to say that I do not know of a single individual in the District of Columbia, whether a property holder or a man without property, who has protested against the passage of these bills, except certain people at Eckington, where the "Y" and other matters in connection with the construction of the road has been changed to meet the objections.

Mr. COWHERD. I want to say to the gentleman that, whether the resolutions have been properly and formally communicated to him or not, all the civic associations of the District have protested against the measure.

Here is the resolution of the board of trade, furnished me from the minutes of that body by the secretary, at my request. The subject of this portion of the resolution is the bill in regard to the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad—in regard to the appropriation of a million and a half of dollars to help them elevate their tracks:

Inasmuch as the improvement provided for in the railroad bill and in this report are properly the work of the railroad, we are opposed to the appropriation of any public funds to pay the expense of bridge approaches and changes of grade. We regard the company's demand for \$1,500,000 as unreasonable, and we recommend that Congress be urged to ignore that request for a gratuity.

In regard to that part of the Pennsylvania Railroad bill which proposes to take 14 acres out of the center of the Mall for the use of this railroad the board of trade says:

The position of the board of trade relative to the occupancy of public parks for railroad purposes has been clearly and frequently defined, is well understood, and has undergone no change.

The gentleman from Wisconsin will bear me out in the statement that the Board of Trade, by resolution, have always opposed the taking of public parks for occupancy for railroad purposes. In regard to the part of the bill embracing the appropriation, the board says:

There remains only the question of the equitable division of the expense involved in this work and of the compensation to be required for the large additional use granted of public parks and streets.

The basis proposed in the bill is that the railroad company should bear all construction expenses included in its right of way, and that the National Government and the District of Columbia should bear the expense of the changes of grade and of the approaches outside of the right of way, and should assume claims for damages due to the changes of grade, etc.

Under ordinary circumstances, and with conditions similar to those prevailing in other cities, such a division of cost would probably be equitable, but the committee is decidedly of the opinion that the property and rights asked by the railroad company, conservatively estimated at \$2,000,000, largely exceed in value the possible sum total of the cost of such changes and damages. The committee is, therefore, opposed to any such proposition as that which would bind the District and General Governments for the payment of costs and damages.

I called the attention of the House to the fact, when these bills were here before, that when we gave the Pennsylvania Railroad

more than two millions and a quarter of dollars' worth of property we more than paid for all that they would expend in changing their road to suit the conditions named in the bill. And when we gave the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad a million and a half we did the same thing in regard to that corporation. This is a resolution of the Board of Trade to the same effect.

The Business Men's Association of the city of Washington comprises about 800 members. It takes in practically all the business men of Washington not included in the Board of Trade; and I understand some gentlemen are members of both bodies, though I am not certain as to that. The Business Men's Association at a meeting discussed this proposition, and here is their resolution:

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Business Men's Association, desiring to preserve intact the beauty and impressiveness of the nation's capital, as strikingly exemplified in its handsome public parks, is emphatically of the opinion that no grant whatsoever of the parking spaces shall be sacrificed to encroachments for railroad purposes, and that no corporation, private or public, shall receive a grant that will in any way involve the sacrifice of a foot of land for such aims as hereinbefore specified.

There are the sentiments of the two largest business associations in this city. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] offered a resolution of the Single Tax Club and stated in offering it that it was signed by a Mr. Ramage—I believe that was his name—who, as the gentleman from Wisconsin supposed, constituted the entire club. The gentleman forgot at that time that nearly every resident of the city of Washington is a single taxpayer. The Single Tax Club, at a meeting held immediately after the passage of that bill—

Mr. BABCOCK. Will the gentleman allow me a word?

Mr. COWHERD. Yes; but I hope the gentleman will grant me an extension of time.

Mr. BABCOCK. I wish simply to say that I presented the petition of the Single Tax Club, and stated, I think, at that time that it was the only protest that I had heard of or been advised of; and it was such a curiosity in itself that I wanted the House to have the benefit of it.

Mr. COWHERD. And the gentleman also stated that he supposed the club consisted only of the gentleman who signed that paper. The club said:

Resolved, That the Washington Single Tax Club, with a membership roll of over 2,000 citizens and taxpayers, who will be directly affected and damaged by the passage of said grants to the railroad corporations, hereby reiterates its most earnest protest against the passage of the pending bills (S. 1929, H. R. 2329), and denounces the same as being vicious, unconstitutional, and unjust.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are three associations comprising nearly 3,000 of the people of the District of Columbia in membership—men of standing, business ability, and character in this community, who protest against this thing; we have the resolutions of the citizens of the East Washington Association protesting against the passage of these bills. These resolutions I have at hand; they were heretofore presented to the House by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], and I shall not consume time by going over them again.

I hold also the resolution of the Georgetown Citizens' Association. The resolutions are long and I will not read them all, but will take the liberty of inserting them in my remarks. They ask that the Government shall give union terminal facilities to the citizens of the District instead of appropriating a large part of the public parks for this purpose, as is proposed here. They say, and this is all that I will quote from their resolutions:

The preservation of the Mall and the south side of Pennsylvania avenue for Government uses is a pressing matter.

And they ask that these bills do not pass. Now, in addition to that we have other associations of citizens—the T Square Association and the Southwest Citizens' Association—protesting against the passage of the bill and against taking the public parks for this purpose. I will also insert these resolutions in the RECORD with my remarks. Here, then, are the great business associations of the city of Washington all of them objecting to this matter. We have the Board of Trade, the Business Men's Association, the East Washington, the West Washington Association, the Single Tax Association, and every single association that I know of in the District of Columbia protesting against the passage of these bills; and I appeal to the gentleman from Wisconsin if it be not true that ninety-nine out of every one hundred citizens in the District are opposed to the passage of these bills instead of favoring them.

Now, I do not pretend, Mr. Speaker, that these measures ought to be tried only by the touchstone of the interests of the citizens of Washington. We ought to consider them on a broader basis. We ought to consider the interests of all the people of the United States, and we ought to consider them in connection with our duties to our constituents in all parts of the Union.

Mr. CLARK. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COWHERD. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. What objection would there be to a sort of plebiscite in Washington and give these people a chance for once in their lives to express their own opinions? [Laughter.]

Mr. COWHERD. Well, I should have no special objection my-

self. I was about to say, if we might believe a statement of the public press, bills have been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds providing for an appropriation of \$7,000,000 to buy land for the site and for the construction of a temple of justice in this city, and another appropriation of two and a half millions more to buy lands and to build a District building.

I do not know what the land will cost, but it is fair to assume from what we know of the price of land usually in the heart of the city that we will spend at least \$2,000,000 for the sites of the buildings; and yet we are giving away 14 acres of ground in the very heart of the city, worth at least \$2,000,000, to this railroad company, and then we proceed to spend these additional millions for the purchase of land to put our own buildings upon. Can such a thing be justified?

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the District building can be located within half a block of the land which you are giving away to the railroad company. I ask, then, again if such a measure should pass the House or receive its approval?

Now, we are told by the public press that the country is already being staggered by the size of the appropriations made by this Congress; and it is being whispered, as I understand it, around the Capitol that word has come from the other end of the Avenue that appropriations should be cut down. The other day the House took up for consideration the Private Calendar. It was private bill day. And the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] used up the greater part of the day in fighting an appropriation of only about \$300,000 to pay debts of the Government, already reduced to judgments, and for which the parties to whom the money was due had waited nearly forty years without a settlement. The roll of the Republican party carries no more illustrious names than the gentlemen to whom I have referred; and yet when an appropriation comes here carrying nearly \$4,000,000 of the people's money, to be given without compensation to favored corporations, instead of standing and fighting it these gentlemen are rushing with eager feet to serve.

I appeal to them and ask if it would not be better to hold up these great appropriations which are gratuities to private interests and pay what the Government actually owes first.

In the last session of this Congress it is estimated that we appropriated (including contracts authorized) about \$768,000,000. The appropriations of the present session will probably exceed that by fifty millions more. That is to say that during the present Congress over one and a half billions of dollars have been appropriated, or will have been before we get through; and here we come with another four millions additional, not to serve any good public end whatever, but to give it to the railroad companies to build depots and enable them to change the grades of their lines, which they should be compelled to do at their own expense and without a cent of aid from the Government.

Mr. Speaker, when this matter was before the House we were told that the Pennsylvania Railroad Company was going to spend \$6,000,000 here, going to spend \$2,000,000 of it on a terminal station. We put in a provision that they should spend a million and a half. The bill goes to the Senate and comes back amended, because, we are told, that they can not spend a million and a half in a depot, unless they bury the gold in the foundations; and so they are allowed to expend it in their depot and in their sheds. I submit to you that when we give this \$2,000,000 to that railroad, and a million and a half to the Baltimore and Ohio, we give more than the total expenditure that the two roads will be compelled to make on account of the measures before the House.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. COWHERD. Will the gentleman yield to me five minutes more? I have been interrupted a good deal.

Mr. BABCOCK. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. COWHERD. One other question, Mr. Speaker. Not very long ago we had a bill up here appropriating money for rivers and harbors, and the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] made a very excellent argument calling for an appropriation to protect the alluvial lands in the valley of the Missouri, and we were told then, and I believe truly, that if Congress would appropriate a reasonable sum thousands of acres of the richest land in the country could be saved and millions of dollars annually added to the revenues of the farmers of those districts by the crops that could be raised upon them. Congress could not see its way clear to appropriate that money. We could not afford to do it, but we can give four times as much as anyone thought of asking for that purpose to these railroads that end in the District of Columbia, for serving no public interest and for no consideration except the love and affection we bear them. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, out yonder in the arid West are millions of acres of Government land, practically worthless to-day. The representatives of that section have been before Congress for years,

asking for some reasonable appropriation, that the Government might undertake the experiment of irrigation where conditions were such the States could not do it. That proposition has been indorsed by every labor union in the United States. Every laboring man in the country is looking to the time when his son may have an opportunity to found a home there, as his father had the opportunity in the great public domain in the Valley of the Mississippi. Congress can not afford to give them that money; but we can afford to give to these two railroads in the District of Columbia \$4,000,000 of the people's money and property to subserve only their private ends.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will vote to disagree to the conference report, and I hope after disagreeing to it they will take possession of the papers, refer the matter to a committee if it can be done; if not, defeat the bills, and next year let the committee bring in a bill that treats both the people and the railroads fairly and gives to the District of Columbia a magnificent union station here, such as it ought to have, and preserve for all time that public park which Washington dedicated forever to the use of the United States among the last moments of his official connection with the District of Columbia.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the courtesy extended. [Applause.]

Irrigation.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. STEWART,

OF NEVADA.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Saturday, January 26, 1901.

The Senate having under consideration the bill (H. R. 12904) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes—

Mr. STEWART said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: The policy of irrigating Indian reservations for the benefit of Indians is established. The only argument adduced against this amendment arises from the fact that it may incidentally benefit white men, and of course white men, if they live in the West, have no rights which certain persons whom I will not name are disposed to respect. In this same bill we find a provision for Indians:

For construction of ditches and reservoirs, purchase and use of irrigating tools and appliances, and purchase of water rights on Indian reservations, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior and subject to his control, \$100,000.

It seems to me, when it is so clear from the conceded facts that this reservoir ought to be built for the sole benefit of the Indians, that it is a very poor reason for objecting to it that it will also enable some white settlers to get homes. There will be more water in the reservoir than the Indians will need. This surplus water will irrigate enough Government land outside the Indian reservation to return the whole cost of the reservoir. It will cost the Government nothing to restore their water to the Indians.

The only excuse they could find to delay building the reservoir for the Indians is this scheme to put a pipe in the dry bed of the stream and catch underflow. That has failed again and again. It is nothing but a temporary makeshift. Everybody who has seen those schemes tried knows that. It is a waste of time to experiment with it.

The little Indian inspector who wanted the handling of this money is the only authority quoted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] against this proposed plan. They are always small when you put them at great work.

Mr. SPOONER. Unless they agree with you.

Mr. STEWART. Unless they agree with you. Of course that would magnify them very much, because it would be some evidence of good sense.

Mr. SPOONER. Strong evidence.

Mr. STEWART. This region of country where this reservoir is proposed to be built is historic ground. Before any race which we now know of inhabited that country large irrigation works were established and cities were built. On one of my earliest trips in that region, crossing from the north to the south, I passed several old ditches higher up than any now used. I spent sometime trying to gratify my curiosity. We found the ruins of these old cities, with pottery there and every evidence of an advanced civilization. It is a remarkably fertile region with water. Without water, of course, it is a desert. Along the river there are several

tribes of Indians—the Pimas, Papagoes, and Maricopas—who carried on their industries. They were a good people. They were irrigators and farmers before the white people went into the country. They remained friendly to the people of the United States during all the Indian wars.

Their villages were a refuge for the pioneers of that Territory when a white man's life was hardly safe anywhere else in the Territory from the murderous Apaches. Now we are taking care of the Apaches. They are fat and sleek. But the friendly Indians must starve because they could not protect themselves. They are the wards of the Government. If they had been white men, they would have gone into court and prevented the diversion of their water. But the Government did not protect them, and now their water is gone, and we are told we can not build this reservoir because we might, in addition to doing justice to the Indians, reclaim some desert Government land and provide a few homes for white men.

These Indians were never dependent on the Government until their water was taken from them. They are not roving Indians. They are farmers. They cultivated their little farms and made a living for themselves, and they will do it again if we give them back their water. If we do not, they must starve or be fed, and to feed them makes beggars and mendicants of them. But some people would seem to prefer that Indians should starve or beg or be made paupers, if necessary, to prevent the Government getting back the cost of the reservoir from settlers on Government land. What is there wrong about the Government getting its money back? What is there wrong about irrigating some desert land so white settlers can cultivate it? Will a few more white men's homes do any harm?

The Government report (Storage of Water on Gila River, Arizona, by Lippincott, House Document No. 351, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session) tells all about these Indians and the way they have been neglected. Here is what it says on page 9:

The Gila River Indian Reservation is occupied chiefly by the Pima and Maricopa Indians and a limited number of Papagoes. The first knowledge we have of these Indians is obtained from a narrative of Cabeza de Vaca, a Spanish explorer, who visited this region about the year 1535, after an adventurous journey overland from Florida. This traveler describes them very much as they are to-day. They occupied the same lands as at present, and have evidently long been industrious and successful farmers and irrigators, as they continued to be for many years after the acquisition of Arizona by the United States. Their average wheat crop was about 2,000,000 pounds a year, besides which corn, pumpkins, beans, sorghum, and vegetables were raised in large quantities. They manufactured ollas, or earthen jars, and baskets and wove very fine blankets and cotton fabrics. They lived in small villages and held their lands in severalty.

The Pimas have always been friends of the whites and enemies of the Apaches. They gave succor and assistance to the early white settlers, and their doors were always open to peaceable whites or Indians when hard pressed by the savage foe. It is their boast that their hands were never stained by the white man's blood. It was under such conditions that they were joined, about a century ago, by the Maricopas, who came as fugitives from the more powerful Yuma tribe. When the belligerent Apaches gave trouble to the settlers, the United States troops sometimes obtained substantial aid and comfort from the Pimas in the way of subsistence.

The agriculture of the Pima Indians was carried on entirely by irrigation with water diverted from Gila River. These tribes have always supported themselves, and their progress toward civilization has been regarded as one of the encouraging features of the Indian problem. During the last ten years, their irrigating water having been taken away from them, they have lapsed into indolence, want, and vice.

Their condition of prosperity, industry, and independence continued until, by the settlement of the Gila Valley above the reservation, the water supply was partly cut off and began to be deficient for the cultivated lands on the reservation.

On March 27, 1895, Mr. J. Roe Young, United States Indian agent at Sacaton, made a terse statement of the case to the Indian Bureau, closing his letter with the following recommendation:

"What is best to be done I do not know. I recommend, however, that a competent, thorough, and skillful engineer, well acquainted with irrigation questions, be employed to ascertain and report, first, whether or not under existing conditions a supply of water adequate to the needs of these Indians can be obtained and retained permanently, and then, if such a supply can be obtained, what is the best, most feasible, practicable, and economical method of doing so.

"To properly do this the engineer should examine carefully the past and present condition and flow of the Gila River, the amount of water which formerly passed through this reservation, and the amount we are now receiving; the number and amount of inches of water for which charters for ditches have been granted in the different counties through which the Gila flows and the amount of water taken out under these charters, together with the number of such charters now legally in force; the underground currents and rock strata along the river, and all matters which, taken together, may lead to some solution of this question. I have been unable to get an estimate of what amount such an investigation and report will cost, but I would suggest that the sum of \$5,000 be set apart from any appropriation available for this purpose. Competent and first-class engineers, with ability to make such a report as this case requires, are scarce and high-priced, and they have to be well paid. It would be money thrown away to employ a man not thoroughly posted.

"This matter should be taken up soon, in order that we may know what to expect for next year."

Mr. Elwood Hadley, who is now (1899) the Indian agent at Sacaton, in describing the present condition of the Indians of the Gila River Reservation, writes as follows, under date of September 25, 1899:

"Approximately 4,000 Indians—Pimas, Papagoes, and Maricopas—are dependent for their subsistence upon the lands of the Gila River Reservation, which reservation contains 357,120 acres. It is estimated that half of the land could be made productive with water to irrigate it. The water supply in the Gila River the present season, owing to its use for lands above us, has not been sufficient to irrigate 1,000 acres. Fully half the crops planted have not

produced enough for seed. This and is very fertile. The condition of affairs here shows that in the past three years there has been a large falling off in the water supply for irrigation. The reason is apparent in the absorption of the water by additional cultivated lands above.

"I notice in the Indians a restlessness as they realize their helpless condition, and am often confronted with the solicitous queries, 'What are we to do? If we plant what we have, what assurance have we of getting it back? Under favorable conditions these Indians, being agricultural and pastoral, would soon become independent, prosperous, civilized citizens. Otherwise, discouragement, hunger, and destitution are their lot. A nomadic life being taken on, their old tribal nature asserts itself, and the expenditures hitherto made and being made by the Government for their education and improvement prove a curse to them rather than a blessing.

"It is now necessary to issue considerable subsistence to the Indians whose crops have been a failure, and this aid will have to be largely increased under the existing limited water supply. A supply of water would permit of the Pima boarding school establishing a model farm, greatly reducing the cost of maintaining the school of 300 pupils, and be a most valuable educational factor in the school life of the pupils. The available Indian labor in the construction of the reservoir is an important factor, as it is much better to provide them labor with pay than keep them as paupers. These Indians are willing to work and their moral status is good. Their attitude toward the United States has always been friendly. They have saved the Government in protecting the early settlers from the ravages of the Apaches. They have kept themselves within the bounds of law and order, and they are now left upon the desert without water. Humanity speaks, economical administration for the sustenance of the Indians speaks, and nature in her wise provisions says: 'Let man's means and intelligence be made operative, that these Indians, whose claims are meritorious, be reinstated in self-sustenance and lifted to the plane of prosperous American citizens.'"

Again (page 17):

AMOUNT OF WATER REQUIRED.

In order to determine the amount of water that will be required for the Indians on the Gila River Indian Reservation, Mr. Elwood Hadley, United States Indian agent at Sacaton, was requested to make a statement on the subject. In his reply, dated October 12, 1899, he writes:

"It is estimated that there are nearly 4,500 Pima and Maricopa Indians on the reservation dependent for their subsistence upon its lands. South of this reservation, in the country lying between the Southern Pacific Railroad and the border line of Mexico, it is estimated that there are nearly 2,000 nomadic Papagos, who derive much of their subsistence from the Pimas of this reservation (Gila River) in exchange for their labor. The Pimas are liberal and kind to their more unfortunate brothers, and give them a share of their products in return for their labor in harvesting the crops.

"The estimated number of Indians under my care is as follows: Pimas, 4,200; Maricopas, 350; Papagos, 2,000; total, 7,250.

"The number named above who live on reservations away from here would gladly come here if they could be furnished with water. It is estimated that 2 acres of land will sustain an Indian."

There has been an investigation of this matter. All the matters that the Senator from Connecticut complained of have been investigated. I read again from this report:

INVESTIGATION IN 1896.

In November, 1895, the Secretary of the Interior instructed the Director of the Geological Survey to detail a civil engineer to make the examination recommended, and Mr. Arthur P. Davis, hydrographer, was accordingly assigned to this task, in which he was assisted by Mr. Cyrus C. Babb, assistant hydrographer, and Mr. J. B. Lippincott, resident hydrographer for California. Six months of time and \$3,500 were expended in the field on the preliminary investigation, and a report was submitted in 1896, entitled *The Report on Irrigation Investigation for the Benefit of the Pima and Other Indians on the Gila River Indian Reservation, Arizona*.

We find in the appropriation act of two years ago the following provision:

For ascertaining the depth of the bedrock at a place on the Gila River in Gila County, Ariz., known as The Buttes, and particularly described in Senate Document No. 27, Fifty-fourth Congress, second session, and for ascertaining the feasibility and estimating in detail the cost of the construction of a dam across the river at that point for purpose of irrigating the Sacaton Reservation, and for ascertaining the average daily flow of water in the river at that point, \$30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, the same to be expended by the Director of the United States Geological Survey, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as in any way committing the United States to the construction of said dam. And said Director shall also ascertain and report upon the feasibility and cost of the Queen Creek project mentioned in said Senate document.

Under this appropriation a preliminary investigation has been made, and the following summary is given to show that the Government can get its money all back from the land (p. 94):

Financial summary of results.

Total water supply to be delivered to the point of diversion from San Carlos reservoir for irrigation each year.....acre-feet..	241,396
Ultimate requirement for Indians.....do.....	40,000
Remainder available for irrigation of public domain or private lands.....acre-feet.....	201,396
Assume a duty of water of 2 acre-feet or 24 inches in depth used each year on each irrigated acre; this would permit the irrigation of lands outside the reservation to the extent ofacres..	100,698
There are 389,211 acres of arid public land in the district to be supplied from this system. Assume that the water is given to the Indians without cost to the Government and that these 100,698 acres must pay the total cost of the works, then the necessary charge per acre for the remaining water rights to be sold would be	\$10.24
It is believed that the public lands with this water right could, at this rate, be sold within a year.	
If 3,000 Indians have to be fed by the Government at a cost per ration per day of 10 cents, the annual expenses would be	\$109,500
The capitalization of \$100,500, at 4 per cent, would represent the practical permanent expense of feeding these tribes. This is equivalent to a permanent Government debt, which would be liquidated by this construction, of	\$2,737,500

The value of the 100,698 acres of irrigated public lands that would be taxable would be \$50 per acre, or a total of \$5,034,900
The saving, without expense to the Government, by irrigation of 20,000 acres of lands belonging to the Indians, has been shown to be 2,737,500

Total increase in value without public expense 7,772,400

There will also be a large increase in value of taxable town property not estimated upon.

The report that came in is very elaborate. They examined all the modes of supplying the reservation with water. It is presented here [exhibiting] with plats, and with a full detail of surveys, and they come to the conclusion that this is the only feasible and practical way of irrigating it. They have to a great extent estimated the cost. They spent the \$20,000 in making this examination. The amount was entirely inadequate to complete the examination.

This provision simply proposes to complete the investigation and the surveys for the purpose of ascertaining the cost, and, in order that the United States may be protected, the amendment proposes to withdraw from settlement a large tract, which is practically desert land, but which would be pounced upon by all sorts of schemes if there was an idea that it was to be irrigated. It will probably irrigate one hundred or a hundred and fifty thousand acres of land, capable of supporting fifty or a hundred thousand people. It is a great enterprise. The ditch necessarily goes through it, and before the ditch is located it is necessary to withdraw the land, so that the Government can hereafter dispose of it.

This commits the Government to nothing that it is not already committed to. It directs the prosecution of the investigation, and in order to complete the investigation and at the same time protect the United States it is necessary to have a survey showing where the ditch will be and what land will be irrigated. So the amendment proposes to withdraw the land until the surveys is made and until all the estimates are in.

You can not make a complete contour survey with a little money. It takes considerable money. A hundred thousand dollars will be required to survey this, and then you will have the proposition before Congress. It is simply carrying out the policy of Congress already settled upon. It involves nothing further than having the facts of this great enterprise fairly brought before Congress. Then, that being done, if it is thought that the policy of irrigating by the Government shall not be adopted, Congress can provide for the sale of this enterprise to private parties, the land will be reserved, and there will be something for the Government to sell.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. May I ask the Senator from Nevada a question?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I understood the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut to be directed to this point, and I think they were very pertinent: Why should the investigation be confined to this particular method of irrigation? Why should it not permit any method of irrigation that may be wise to be investigated?

Mr. STEWART. There is a pamphlet here showing why. They have already gone on. There is no other method.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Connecticut says the other methods have not been exhausted.

Mr. STEWART. He thinks they have not. I think they have.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator permit me? Why is the clause which was contained in the original authority to investigate left out of this provision? It provided that nothing in it should commit the Government to this enterprise.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If I understand—

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President—

Mr. STEWART. One at a time.

Mr. THURSTON. That suggestion was not made in committee this year, and I see no reason why there would be an objection to adding it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then that would meet the point made by the Senator from Connecticut. I was about to ask the Senator from Nevada whether it is true that all other methods of irrigation have been tried and have been cast aside as inadequate?

Mr. STEWART. You will get some water, some underflow, but there were men before the committee who said that the underflow is now down 3 or 4 or 5 feet deeper than it was a few years ago. You can not get a permanent supply in that way.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I understand that the Senator from Nebraska says he will accept that amendment.

Mr. STEWART. I want to say something, if you will let me have the floor for a while.

The policy is established that we should irrigate for the Indians. We give them vast tracts of land, and we may spend three or four hundred thousand dollars a year irrigating for them, and we have it conducted under inexperienced men, Indian inspectors or something of that kind; yet if by any possibility the irrigation benefits the white man, then it becomes a monster. That is the extraordinary feature of the opposition to this measure. They say you can

not irrigate to help the Indians if by any chance there may be some irrigation for white men, too. Agriculture has been conducted more by irrigation than by rainfall in this world. All ancient agriculture was by irrigation.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No.

Mr. STEWART. Pretty nearly all was by irrigation. Only recently have they undertaken to subdue countries where there was rainfall. See the great irrigation works in Africa and in Western Asia. All those great civilizations were by means of irrigation. Two-fifths of the entire area of the United States requires irrigation. It is a vast empire where you can make homes for 50,000,000 people, if irrigated, and it will not be nearly so thickly populated then as were ancient countries. You see ruins of the irrigation plants of the ancients; they are being excavated now, and other people are taking an interest in it. In Egypt they are excavating old irrigation works, which show that the Sahara Desert or a large part of it was once irrigated, to the wonder of the world. There is masonry there that can not be surpassed to-day. It is being developed everywhere.

Here we have a country of immense possibility, and because this improvement may be used for the benefit of white people there is objection to it. If it could not be used for white people, if it could not benefit white people, there would be no objection to it. There is no objection to irrigating for the Indians. But here, according to the report, the Indians can not be successfully supplied without at the same time providing more water than they need and benefiting white people. The Senator says, How can you build this reservoir without injuring the Florence Canal Company? The canal company took it from the Indians, but the settlers under the canal bought their land of the Government. It will be hard to take the water away from them and give it back to the Indians now. That would ruin the white settlers. Nobody proposes to do that.

But by building this reservoir the Government can provide new supplies for the Indians, so as not to injure the white settlers under the canal. Justice can be done to all parties, no one will be injured, and the Government can get all its money back. But that seems to be what they object to—that and the possibility that some of the desert might be irrigated to make homes for some more white men.

Mr. SPOONER. The whole subject of irrigation is a very large one. We have a Committee on Irrigation, have we not?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. Is the Senator from Nevada chairman of it?

Mr. STEWART. No.

Mr. SPOONER. He was at one time.

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. Now, if the Government is to be committed to the scheme of irrigation—it may be a good thing—why is not a bill brought in here, an independent proposition, which can be debated?

Mr. STEWART. Because the Senate is not sufficiently educated.

Mr. SPOONER. That is the way to educate it. Why is it always done on some provision in an appropriation bill?

Mr. STEWART. So that we can talk about it and discuss it.

Mr. SPOONER. All you want, then, is talk?

Mr. STEWART. No; I want you educated. I want to accomplish something. If I can educate you and get you to understand it, you will be the most enthusiastic friend of irrigation in the Senate.

Mr. SPOONER. Very likely; but every attempt to inaugurate this system has been by stealth.

Mr. STEWART. It is not done by stealth.

Mr. SPOONER. We discussed one proposition at the last session of Congress which was under the guise of the improvement of navigation.

Mr. STEWART. Let me tell you something—

Mr. SPOONER. It was perfectly obvious—

Mr. STEWART. Let me tell you something perfectly new to you, that you do not know.

Mr. SPOONER. I will not say that I do not until I know what you are going to say.

Mr. STEWART. You will hear it right now. We are spending \$10,000,000 in the river and harbor bill to improve the navigation of the Mississippi River, when we all know that that is not the purpose. It is to protect the lands there. We know that is the purpose. A great many things are done by indirection. I should not be surprised if my friend the Senator from Wisconsin has done some cunning things by indirection. He does not always tell what he is after. I am willing to say that I should like to see this experiment tried, because it is the only way of supplying the Indians, and in addition it may illustrate a great principle. There should be no objection to it.

Mr. SPOONER. As a lawyer I have not always informed my antagonist what I was about, but as a legislator I have endeavored to be frank and not to seek in legislation to accomplish anything by indirection.

Mr. STEWART. I am not seeking to accomplish anything by indirection.

Mr. SPOONER. Every time this irrigation proposition comes before the Senate, instead of coming at an early day in the session and in the form of some well-defined plan, reported by the Committee on Irrigation, so that we can consider it and be educated by the Senator—

Mr. STEWART. It would take a long time to educate you. We could not get a hearing.

Mr. SPOONER. It would take a long time, perhaps, to be educated by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. But it always comes under cover.

Mr. STEWART. Who is making this speech?

Mr. SPOONER. If you do not want me to interrupt you, I will not. But it always comes under cover.

Mr. STEWART. No; it does not come under cover. It does not always come in that way. Here is a proposition in this bill for irrigating Indian land. It has gone through every time, but there is objection to this because it may incidentally irrigate other lands. It is a proposition where you can not irrigate the Indian lands without irrigating other lands, and because you can not do it, are you going to let the Indians starve? There are over 5,000 Indians there. There is no way of getting a permanent supply of water unless you build the reservoir, which will provide more water than the Indians need, which can be used for irrigating some other Government land. Therefore, rather than benefit the white man, you will not have a survey and you will not have an investigation.

Nobody is going to undertake this enterprise unless the land can be reserved. If the lands are not withdrawn before the survey is made there will be obstructions in the way. Nobody will do it, private parties will not do it, the Government will not do it unless it can have the benefit of the irrigation when it comes. This bill provides for that.

I desire to say to the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Wisconsin that Eastern people are not so universally against the improvement of this vast region as you might suppose in the first instance. Nearly the entire press of the country advocates the reclamation of these arid lands.

A more direct way of improving the Mississippi would be to make lakes in the mountains, and you would not require so large an annual appropriation for the Mississippi. I have no doubt that great results can be accomplished by storing the water, to mitigate the floods, but the objection is raised that it will benefit lands in western Kansas and Nebraska, and probably western Arkansas—in fact, all through the West and on the Missouri River and its tributaries. That, they say, must not be done. You must let all the floods come down if by stopping them you would reclaim the arid lands. They say that must not be done. Better to have the floods, they say, than to reclaim any of the deserts—and so the floods keep on coming.

You do not make objection, and I do not make objection, to building up the banks to protect the people from overflows. I believe it ought to be done, and if that is the only way in which those States can be protected I am in favor of doing it. But if you are going to protect them by building up banks, why not do it also by building the reservoirs. You may say it is doing it by indirection, but you put the appropriations in the river and harbor bill to build up the banks, and I am in favor of doing it, not because it is necessary for the improvement of navigation, but because it is necessary to protect those great States from overflows. That is why it is done. And if the appropriation to build the banks goes in the river and harbor bill, there is no reason why the appropriation for the reservoir should not go there too.

Now, here is a case where you can not successfully irrigate the lands for the Indians—we have had the investigation and we have reports on it—without this great reservoir and canal. Nobody will undertake that work unless the land is withdrawn. You can not make any progress toward it unless you have a survey and the withdrawal of the land. You have to make a contour survey and withdraw the lands, and then undoubtedly you can find many persons and many corporations, if you are willing to let it be monopolized when you have surveyed it, to take it off the hands of the Government. It ought not to be monopolized. The Government ought to do it. But that country ought not to be always a desert. It is the grandest enterprise I know of to reclaim a very large amount of land which, when it is reclaimed, is worth from thirty to fifty dollars an acre. It is marvelously productive; you will build up a prosperous community there; and these incidental benefits that come from it should not be an objection to the building of that reservoir.

The trouble I have found is the general fear that legislation might be enacted which in some way would develop the West. You make Indian reservations without paying any attention to the white people, and you exclude the latter from them. You protect barbarism; you do anything but give the whites a fair show. You must admit this ought to be done for the benefit of

the Indians; and it is absurd to say that it must not be done because it might also benefit the whites.

There is no reason why this experiment should not be conducted to its consummation. Let us know what can be done. This water may be taken out on either side of the river. There is a vast region on each side of the river that may be irrigated. As soon as you determine where it shall be, unless you withdraw the land, there will be scrip and all sorts of obstructions in your way. So in connection with this investigation we have the land withdrawn; and that is all there is new in the proposition. It is merely carrying on further the former investigation which was ordered. We have the preliminary report of it. It is just finishing up this investigation, and it is provided that there shall be a sufficient survey to enable the Department to determine what lands will be irrigated, and then if it must be done—if you will not let the Government do it—you can turn it over to private parties.

It will be a square proposition, after the investigation is made, whether the Government will do the work, notwithstanding the fact that it does benefit white people. That will be the question then. That question does not arise now. We are committed to the policy of making this investigation, and why should it not be completed? The other modes for supplying it have been exhausted. We went down there with an appropriation of \$20,000 last year to feed the Indians because their lands could not be irrigated. If their land could have been irrigated by the water that can be reservoired there, they would not have needed to be fed.

Mr. TELLER. The appropriation was \$30,000.

Mr. STEWART. We appropriated \$30,000 to feed the Indians because their lands could not be irrigated. The Indians would have accomplished it themselves if they could have done it. They got along all right before their water was taken away from them. They are industrious and intelligent Indians, and there is no trouble about that. They would have done all this themselves if it had been practicable. The fact that it was not done and we appropriated \$30,000 to feed them shows that it could not be done. They can build the ditches to carry the water to their farms. But they can not build this reservoir themselves. If it was being built they could do much of the work on it and earn wages to keep them until the reservoir is completed. Then they would have the water again.

Now, it is said the reservoirs will fill up. There are various modern methods of keeping reservoirs clean. Land in India has been irrigated for thousands of years and reservoirs have been filled up, but they have methods of cleaning them, methods of sluicing them out. I believe we can keep these reservoirs entirely clean. The report from Mr. Schuyler (Senate Document 152, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session) says they can, and he investigated that very proposition for the Government. We can not reclaim any of our desert lands unless we keep the water flowing. Of course there must be an aqueduct at the lower part of it to let the water out. That water can be sluiced off, so as to go down and keep it clean. That is the modern theory. The idea that we can not maintain a reservoir is a proposition against any irrigation.

This is the most magnificent place in the United States for an experiment. Let us know the facts before any large amount of money is spent. It will require only \$100,000 to make the necessary surveys and secure the dam site. When that is done, the Government is not committed at all. If they find that because it benefits the whites it ought not to be done, it will be time enough to stop then. But to stop before an investigation is made, on the theory that it might benefit somebody besides the Indians, although it may be the only method by which the Indians can be supplied, and I think it is, is absurd. You have got to feed these Indians or irrigate their land. It may be that you will think when the survey is made that it will be better to feed them. That may be the result, but before you make the determination that it is better to feed them than to have the work done, you had better hesitate, particularly since you have undertaken it.

You have got a partial report, and to make the report available for any purpose it will require an appropriation of another hundred thousand dollars. The appropriation of \$20,000 went as far as it could, but they could not make for that amount any survey that would be complete enough for practical purposes. You have ascertained the facts for \$20,000, and they have done a great work, more than is usually done for that amount of money. They have exhibited the facts, and they have come to the conclusion, as they say here, that this is the only method to irrigate the Indian reservation. Let us know the extent of it, what it will amount to. Then we will determine what shall be done.

I have no doubt if you should give the land which could be irrigated to a private corporation the work would be done. There is no doubt about that. There may not be many parallel cases to this, but in this case the land that will be irrigated will pay for the expense of the reservoir and the ditch many times over, because it is exceedingly valuable. You will hardly find another place such as that in the world. Let us have the facts about it and then let the Government advertise for bids to do it if the Gov-

ernment does not want to do it itself. I would not be in favor of doing that. I think the Government ought to do it. But it ought to be done in some way, because here is a place for from 50,000 to 100,000 people if the land is irrigated.

The people of the West have good cause to complain when the people of the East object to ordinary appropriations for the Indian service because it may benefit the whites. Senators talk about this being an entering wedge. I am not in favor of any entering wedge, but I am in favor of investigating and determining whether we can not stop the flow that goes down the Mississippi and keep the water up there and irrigate the West. I am in favor of some experiments. This would be an object lesson worth trying. Great Britain has spent in India over a hundred million dollars in irrigation works, and has continuously spent it, to help develop that country.

These are great enterprises, and they demand a very large expenditure. The debt of India consists in irrigation works and railroads to develop that country, and they have made it very productive. If it had not been for the irrigation works the famine there would have been universal. Famine comes there on account of drought.

The West will in time be teeming with population. It is bound to come. Two-fifths of the area of the United States is not going to remain a barren waste when everybody knows that it can be reclaimed and be made the most productive land in the world. One acre of irrigated land will produce as much as 4 acres of any other land. You can go into any State of the Union you please, and on land properly irrigated you can raise a maximum crop every year, and generally two or three crops with the water that comes down and fertilizes it.

This is a great proposition, and it would not be doubted at all if it had not been condemned as an evil purpose and the charge made that somebody wanted to swindle the Government; that somebody wanted to rob the Government. When I see \$80,000,000 in a river and harbor bill to benefit every little creek and harbor all over the country, and when I see \$10,000,000 of that going to protect the farmers in the Mississippi Valley, which ought to be done, I do not think it is a crime to suggest that some of these waters might be kept in reservoirs above, and thus relieve that river and spread the fertility over a vast region, which will be more fertile than any other we have. Irrigated land is the best land. The time will come when there will be a teeming population in those mountains. It may come slowly, but I do not think it ought to be condemned as a crime, and the people of the East do not think so either. I will ask also to insert in my remarks comments and papers on the subject of irrigation from every section of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the papers will be inserted in the RECORD as a part of the Senator's remarks.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Editorial extracts on the national irrigation policy.]

In the nature of things the construction and maintenance of irrigation works are public functions like the building of light-houses or public highways, and the former can as ill be made objects of commercial enterprise as the latter. There is water sufficient for the irrigation of from 75,000,000 to 100,000,000 acres, depending upon the methods of conservation employed. Probably 10,000,000 people could find homes on farms and be self-supporting if the water supply should be properly regulated. A better investment was never made by a government since the world began.—*Philadelphia Record*.

The meaning of the enterprise is one that ought to enlist enthusiasm. It means peace and prosperous homes, good citizenship, and a very appreciable addition to our national wealth. It means actual expansion from within. It means life to a vast section that is now dead and deserted. Some may feel that the enterprise is not one of national concern. It is the nation's business to strengthen the nation, and this can be done quite as surely by development from within as by extension from without.—*Boston Transcript*.

Irrigation has long since passed beyond the experimental stage. It has even reached the point where little can be done by private capital. Yet vast areas of the public domain remain unreclaimed in localities where land would have a high value if an artificial water supply were assured the year round. Without storage reservoirs they would be barren and useless indefinitely, but once irrigation becomes possible they will be quickly settled and will support a much larger population than the same number of acres of land maintain in regions where normal rainfall prevails.—*Philadelphia North American*.

The advocates of Federal aid to irrigation declare that the scientific storing and distribution of water would so regulate the amount which finds its way to the rivers as to make extreme fluctuations almost unknown. Wing dams, levees, and riprap would not be destroyed, channels would not be suddenly choked with sand, and thus millions would be saved. The argument is an interesting one, and there are others in support of irrigation under Government control that are even more forcible.—*Minneapolis Times*.

The great scramble for farm lands reported from Minnesota in the White Earth Reservation, including only four townships lately ceded for occupation by white settlers, certainly indicates that the reclaiming of land by irrigation would be a popular measure of government. More than 2,000 people joined in the rush to secure homes, and for days hundreds of men waited at the door of the land office to buy homes at \$1.25 per acre. These are genuine home seekers.—*Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator*.

Under Government supervision and control irrigation will make a garden land out of what has been called a desert, and the entire community will share in the great benefits.—*Minneapolis Progress*.

In calling attention to the National Irrigation Congress the President of the Pennsylvania State College refers to "the planting on the soil of a great population with the employments and habits of rural life, and yet so compactly settled as to be able to secure the advantages in the way of schools,

colleges, churches, entertainments, and all that goes to make up the best social and public life which can commonly be secured only in the largest towns."—*New York Journal of Commerce*.

Captain Chittenden of the Engineering Department of the Government asserts that there are 75,000,000 acres that might be made highly profitable agricultural lands at a cost of \$2 an acre for storage. It is probable that in the near future the Government will take the matter up. It certainly seems worth while.—*Kansas City World*.

A national system of irrigation and forest protection will be a gigantic proposition, and can be handled with success alone by the National Government. Like the deepening of the waterway channels, the building of light-houses and Government locks for the immediate benefit of a few, but for the ultimate benefit of all, the establishment of a system of irrigation to bring under cultivation the vast arid tracts of the West is also an enterprise within the peculiar province of the central Government.—*St. Paul Globe*.

The construction of storage reservoirs is no longer looked upon as a scheme to loot the National Treasury, but as a proposition which bears the same relation to the nation as the improvement of rivers and harbors, the construction of the Nicaragua Canal, the building of the Pacific roads, and the laying of ocean cables. There is no more certain method of promoting commerce, domestic and interstate, as well as foreign and international, than by building up and promoting the industries of all portions of the nation.—*Denver News*.

The country can not afford to permit the monopoly of the flowing streams. In many Western localities growers are dependent upon those who by prior water right control the water supply. It is time our statesmen were listening to the vast and important new issues coming up.—*Racine (Wis.) Journal*.

The East is much interested in a general reclamation of arid Western lands. There is just as much argument to be advanced in favor of national irrigation in the West as there was in favor of national control and improvement of rivers and harbors.—*New York News*.

There are many manufacturers in Massachusetts, for instance, whose prosperity and that of those dependent upon them depend very largely upon the Western markets. They see clearly enough the relation of the reclamation of the West to the business interests of the East.—*Brooklyn Citizen*.

One of the greatest physical and economic problems that to-day is attracting the attention of the people of the United States is the reclaiming of arid lands. Nor is there another problem the solution of which will bring about such far-reaching and beneficial results. Now that the Presidential question has been disposed of, the problem of reclamation of arid lands by the Government and for the people will be in order.—*Buffalo (N. Y.) Enquirer*.

The reclamation of the arid lands will furnish comfortable homes for teeming myriads of people. Their settlement will furnish traffic for the railroads and a market for endless quantities of manufactured articles, while the surplus products of the field will be sent to the remotest markets of the world. The problem is certainly important enough to command general attention.—*Chicago Post*.

When the Government has done its duty toward that (Western) portion of the continent, the cities of the Pacific coast will soon be larger and more magnificent than the cities of the Atlantic coast. California alone will have some day 30,000,000 of people, and that day will dawn in the new century if the Government will not act the part of a shrewd landlord on the Pacific coast.—*Chicago Chronicle*.

Any great improvement which will benefit not only the territory adjacent but the whole country should be made. The isthmian canal would do this, and therefore should be constructed. Of scarcely less importance is the proposed plan to reclaim the vast extent of the arid lands of the West. The fact that Vice-President-elect Roosevelt, General Miles, and other prominent officials of the Government are in favor of the great improvement must be encouraging.—*Cleveland (Ohio) World*.

When in his letter to the irrigation congress General Miles said that private or corporate enterprise could not be trusted with the water monopoly in the arid regions of the West, he expressed a sentiment that will meet with a chorus of approval in every State and Territory where irrigation is employed. There is work of great magnitude to be done, which would be impossible to any other agency than the Federal Government.—*Chicago Times-Herald*.

It is probably true that the millions of acres of arid lands still existing, which might be made to blossom as the rose if water could be turned through them, must remain arid unless the National Government takes some action. Enormous possibilities of material development are wrapped up in this question. There are sections of the country where one piece of land is worth \$500 an acre, while land adjoining is not worth more than 50 cents; the difference being that the one is irrigated and the other is not.—*Boston Journal*.

In the results of irrigation men who have studied it see not only the reclaiming of a rich soil, but the promise of a new form of rural society born of the neighborliness and the community of interests which irrigation brings about.—*Syracuse (N. Y.) Standard*.

If these floods could be stored and released gradually as required for purposes of irrigation, these dry and barren areas might be rendered as highly productive as the land now under cultivation, whose products are the wonder and admiration of the world. The people of this State should get behind the movement to have the General Government adopt the motto of "Save the Forests and store the floods," and should demand of their representatives in both Houses of Congress active support for measures designed to put it into effect.—*San Jose (Cal.) Mercury*.

The problem that will confront Congress is what methods and measures of legislation will open and develop the resources of the arid region, which comprise millions of acres of fertile lands that are now wastes for want of fructifying waters that can be utilized.—*Dallas News*.

We have an arid area in our great West large enough to give every poor man in the United States a comfortable little home if only such lands were rendered habitable and productive by irrigation. Just now, when the nation is talking so much of "expansion," and the people have seemingly endorsed the proposition that we need "more territory," it ought to be comparatively easy to arouse national action to acquire thousands of square miles of practically "new territory."—*Houston Post*.

The West is a unit in desiring the reclamation of its arid lands. Appropriations for this purpose are demanded not only by reason of the obligation of the nation to improve its property, but as an offset to the great sums contributed by the arid interior for the improvement of the rivers and harbors of the rest of the country. The work of the National Irrigation Association has been mainly a propaganda among the merchants and manufacturers of the East for the purpose of arousing them to the importance of opening new markets by irrigation. This propaganda has been remarkably successful.—*San Francisco Chronicle*.

The people of the arid region who understand the irrigation problem desire national appropriations to be confined to the construction of storage reservoirs, and, in a very few cases, to long and expensive canals, the construction of which is beyond the ability of private or State enterprise. If the reclamation of the arid region makes homes for 10,000,000 people it will more than justify all the expense involved.—*Denver Republican*.

What the nation is asked to do for the arid lands of the West is just what

the nation has been doing for almost a century for the low-lying bottom lands of the Lower Mississippi, and that is, to construct such works for the government of the water of the country as will render the land habitable and tillable.—*Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal-Democrat*.

Ordinary business sense demands that the Federal Government take up the work of irrigation. National irrigation enterprise would be beneficial in more ways than one. It would be profitable to the Government because it would enhance the value of Government land. It would provide an immense amount of work for men anxious to earn fair wages. It would build up a great section of the country that would be a splendid market for American manufacturers. Governmental neglect of irrigation is criminal.—*Omaha World-Herald*.

The most interesting argument advanced at the recent irrigation convention is that the controlling of water sources for irrigation purposes would prevent the great floods which annually destroy river improvements, and that thus Federal investment in irrigation reservoirs would be Federal economy.—*Seattle Times*.

As the scheme of irrigation, like that of transportation, covers many States, it properly belongs to the Federal Government. Here is a million square miles of territory lying wholly untouched for the want of moisture. When we remember the fact that less than 500,000 square miles of arable land produce all our grain, hay, cotton, sugar, and vegetables, the importance of the reclaiming of this vast territory appears in its true light.—*St. Paul Globe*.

The systematic irrigation, through Government appropriations, of the arid West, would mean a greater advantage to New England, beyond a doubt, than any other measure of national legislation which is likely to be adopted.—*Boston dispatch to New York Mail and Express*.

The reclamation of 100,000,000 acres of arid land, capable of supporting 50,000,000 inhabitants, has become a national issue, and it is believed will be settled by the present Administration, which is pledged to this end by its party platform.—*Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch*.

Fortunately for us we still have a domain of almost illimitable extent, which is capable of supporting a population as large in itself as that we have at present, once water is brought to it. Water is all that is needed to make the now arid West the garden of the world. The time has now come when this matter demands the country's earnest attention.—*Chicago Journal*.

Much misinformation exists in the East regarding the national irrigation movement, and some Eastern agricultural papers even go so far as to oppose the whole thing, fearing that it will mean an increase of Western competition. On the contrary, the peopling of the now arid region would furnish a home market for vast quantities of Eastern manufactures, and would produce comparatively little surplus farm crops for shipment to the East.—*Orange Judd Farmer*.

Irrigation is a subject about which Americans should be concerned. There is no movement which could do so much for the United States as the irrigation of the arid plains. The Journal hopes that an effort will be turned in that direction. There is no work which could so certainly add to the wealth of the nation. In the center of the continent lies the grandest possibilities of the nation.—*Lafayette (Ind.) Journal*.

There is no doubt that vast areas of land can be reclaimed by irrigation. What Congress has to guard against is schemes to benefit mere private enterprise at public expense. The Government should control the distribution and settlement of the land reclaimed, to permit its people everywhere to share in the advantages to be provided. A project so guarded will be beneficial, and the people of every section of the country can consistently approve of it.—*Springfield (Ill.) Register*.

The Government experts have surveyed the arid lands, measured the water supply and made estimates as to the cost of increasing or regulating the latter. All that Congress is asked to do now is to make a beginning. It is believed that such success will follow the building of one storage reservoir that the advisability of others will never be questioned, and that they will thereafter be built wherever opportunity presents and the financial resources of the National Government allow.—*New York Commercial Advertiser*.

Tens of thousands of farmers settled upon small but highly productive farms would add greatly by their labors to the agricultural products of the United States, and would be new, good customers of its manufacturers and merchants. This is one reason why so many prominent Chicago business men are interested in this irrigation question. There is no doubt that any extensive plan for the reclamation of the arid lands can be carried on to much better advantage by the General Government than by the States.—*Chicago Tribune*.

The problem of the arid land is one of the prettiest and most promising problems before the country. The Government alone can secure the preservation of the forests of the West which are vital to the continuance of the water supply. It can control the water supply itself, and this no private corporation can do. Irrigation is a matter demanding public supervision and control, and the National Government alone is in a position of carrying on the work of promoting it. What concerns the arid lands of the Rocky Mountain region concerns every part of the United States.—*Syracuse (N. Y.) Post-Standard*.

Captain Chittenden's report puts the area that might be reclaimed at 75,000,000 acres. Here is size enough for an imperium in imperio; or, if the term offends, a republic within a republic. The Eastern overflow will need its outlet for population for many years to come, and it is that fact which makes this interesting proposition worthy of consideration in this section. There would be no great risk taken in the proposed expenditure, as gradually as it would have to be made, because the Government could make its own terms and guard itself effectually against any ultimate loss by the outlay.—*Boston Transcript*.

The disadvantage of permitting the work of irrigation to be done by private corporations or syndicates is that the irrigation companies secure control of the water supply. Having done this, they forever afterwards hold the key to the situation, and unless their plans are comprehensive, their construction work substantial, and their water rates reasonable—which conditions are seldom or never fully realized—they are a hindrance to the complete irrigation of the dependent locality. For these reasons the National Government ought to take hold of the irrigation problem and work it out on a thorough and homogeneous plan. The newly elected National Administration and Congress are fully committed to the policy of nationalizing the work of irrigation.—*Chicago Record*.

The arid West feels justified in demanding from the Federal Government assistance in the great task that confronts it. For many years now millions upon millions of public funds, contributed in part by the States of this region, have been expended upon the harbors, the rivers, and the creeks of other States in the interest of commerce, and there is a growing conviction that we are entitled to equal consideration. And it is worthy of note that shrewd business men of the East are beginning to realize what the reclamation of the arid West means to them. It would insure a trade expansion of far greater magnitude than may be accomplished in the Orient. And it is because the Eastern press now realizes this truth that it has taken up the irrigation question and is urging a systematic and definite policy of national irrigation.—*Salt Lake Herald*.

The irrigation movement has passed far beyond the local stage. The whole country is awake to its worth. It sees that the work is practicable,

that it needs only to be broadly planned to utilize only available resources, that it will go near to doubling the present population of the country, and will swell its wealth almost beyond computation.

The West is primarily interested, though little more vitally than the East, each as part of the industrially foremost nation in civilization.—*Denver Times*. No one who has given the matter of Federal storage of flood waters any thought has a single argument to offer why it should not be done, and already a majority of the members of the present Congress at Washington have expressed themselves as in favor of the proposition.—*Rapid City (S. Dak.) Journal*.

Irrigation is the problem upon which hinges the redemption of millions of acres of arid land throughout the Western States and Territories. Considerable work has been accomplished in this line through the employment of private capital, but if ever proper results are realized the Government itself must take hold of the matter.—*St. Louis Star*.

This is a great problem and must be carefully considered. It is generally conceded that these lands ought to be reclaimed. But it will be a costly undertaking, and perhaps only the Government can undertake it. Moreover, the longer the work is delayed the more difficult it will be to do.—*Philadelphia Press*.

As long as fertile, well-watered land with virgin soil remained to be exploited, naturally but little interest could be excited over leagues of arid waste known in the earlier geographies as "the great American desert." Now that the public lands in the humid and subhumid areas are practically all taken up it is natural and inevitable that the problem of dealing with these neglected portions of territory should call more urgently for solution.—*Chicago News*.

This is an area larger than New York and New England combined, and the opening of it for successful agriculture would add much to the productive capacity of the country. Without doubt the Government soon will move in that direction, reclaiming comparatively small tracts from year to year, until the whole territory is brought under cultivation.—*Troy (N. Y.) Record*.

The fact still remains that the scheme is practicable and profitable, and the General Government is the only agency by which it can be carried through. The people of the West will continue demands that something be done, and if necessary will nurse the idea until it becomes a burning issue to worry statesmen at election time. There will be no "glamour" about it when it becomes necessary to write "Irrigation" in the national party platforms and dangerous to forget that plank after the votes are cast.—*Los Angeles Express*.

The arid region of this country is larger than the entire area of some of the nations of the earth. It includes over a million square miles, enough, in fact, to accommodate one-half the people of the United States when the land is made productive. To allow all this splendid country to go to waste would be contrary to the spirit of a practical nation.—*Saturday Evening Post (Philadelphia)*.

In irrigation for the extensive arid lands in the West the Government could also profitably expend vast appropriations. A region representing an empire remains uninhabited because there is no water to fertilize it. Irrigation would fill it up with millions of population.—*Newark (N. J.) Advertiser*.

This work of irrigation development of the public lands will add population and wealth to the entire country. To annex arid America to other productive area will do more for this country than anything else. For one thing, it will create passenger and freight business in districts at present unprofitable locally to railroads. This will invite a reduction of transcontinental railroad rates in the desert districts.—*Los Angeles Post*.

Teddy Roosevelt sent a ringing message to the irrigation congress, recently held, in which he gives his views on the irrigation and forestry questions and favors these ideas for the upbuilding and betterment of the West, with the needs of which he is more or less familiar. His letter is concluded by the following:

"The East is interested in the development of the arid lands of the West, just as the West is interested in the proper development of our harbor system and of our commerce on the high seas. No part of this country can be permanently benefited without a reflex benefit to the other part. As Americans we are all interested in the progress of any part of our common country, and while your movement is of immediate benefit to the West its ultimate benefit will be shared by the East as well."—*Norfolk (Nebr.) Journal*.

Governor Roosevelt's suggestions appeared sound and sensible, but every one of them turned on the postulate of Government control. And the more the problem is studied, the more clearly it will be seen that this is the only way to treat it that promises satisfactory results. The area that must be dealt with is too great to be bounded by State lines, and any practical plan must ignore them. But this brings up the greatest problem in the whole scheme of Western irrigation.—*Philadelphia Public Ledger*.

There has been created among manufacturers, merchants, and bankers in all sections of the country a sentiment favorable to water storage for irrigation by the Federal Government. It is believed that a large influence in every Eastern State can now be rallied to the support of a bill in Congress for an appropriation for the actual building of a reservoir dam.—*Phoenix Republican*.

It proposes to annex in an industrial sense millions of arid acres, right "in our midst." In the middle of our national domain this Government holds 75,000,000 acres, which would cost \$2 per acre to make it fit for farms. We can settle the acquisition with American citizens or those fit to become so immediately.—*Portland, Me., Argus*.

As the Government controls rivers, it could appropriately undertake the diversion of superfluous waters in the winter and early spring into reservoirs where it could be stored until it should be needed in the spring and summer. The Government is the more interested in such work because it would probably end the floods that have caused such loss of life and property. The water which now swells the Missouri and Mississippi to undue proportions at times would be diverted for use in transforming deserts into gardens.

This new farming community would increase the market for manufactured goods, and would largely add to the agricultural wealth of the land. For both these reasons the East, as well as the West, is interested in the irrigation development.—*Kansas City Star*.

The project, if carried out, will be a benefit to the nation. It will add an enormous area of very fertile land to the national domain, which will furnish homes to a vast population. An additional market will be created for our manufacturers, the railroads will be furnished with additional traffic, and the wide gap between the great central valley and the Pacific slope will be bridged over. Hence there is a national aspect to the matter which renders it entirely proper that Congress should take action.—*Toledo Blade*.

The necessity of doing something to reclaim arid lands has been slowly filtering through the minds of Western legislators for ten years or more. It is time they got together for a united attack upon the House and Senate committees that deal with internal improvements. There are enough Congressmen from the West and their mentality and aggressiveness are of sufficiently high order to make a stir if they concentrate their energies.—*Spokane Review*.

The two general plans that involve all the others are the storage of storm waters and reservoirs and the preservation and extension of the forest. Certainly the success of the Mormons in Utah shows how a desert may be made

to bloom by carefully laid plans. The work of the irrigation congress is of interest not alone to the farmers of the far West or to those who have interest in arid sections of the country.—*Philadelphia Inquirer*.

The time is probably not far distant when the Government will see the wisdom of doing something to save much of the water that now goes to waste in the States of the Rocky Mountain region. Irrigation has long since passed beyond the experimental stage. It has even reached the point where little more can be done by private capital. Yet vast areas of the public domain remain unreclaimed in localities where land would have a high value if an artificial water supply were assured the year round.—*Omaha Bee*.

A hundred million acres of good land are unfit for cultivation, and, in fact, for habitation, because the rainfall is not sufficient to insure crops. The national interest that is being manifested in reclaiming this big stretch of arid land shows that work along the right line is progressing rapidly. The expense of putting this land into a profitable agricultural condition of course is very great, but if Uncle Sam gets back of it, and the right men engineer it, there will be but little difficulty in creating a desirable territory for new homes for industrious farmers.—*Drovers' Journal, Chicago*.

In his letter to the National Irrigation Congress, Governor Roosevelt gave vigorous expression to his sympathy with the movement to preserve the forests and to make tillable and fertile the now arid region of the West. About the time the Governor was writing his letter to the irrigation congress there appeared in the Country Gentleman, the leading agricultural paper of New York, an article urging the farmers of that State to oppose all plans for irrigation in the West at Government expense, not so much because of the expense as because the reclamation of arid lands of the West would increase the number of competing farmers in the markets, and would thus decrease the profits of the New York farmers. The narrow selfishness of this is disgusting. It is a part, perhaps, of the rank conservatism that would prevent the development of the country.—*Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch*.

The average home keeps its own members busy, but it also keeps another home busy making things to exchange with it. Homes in the now arid regions of the West would mean additions to Eastern factories and transportation service.—*Los Angeles (Cal.) Express*.

It would seem to be a good investment for the Government from a business standpoint, as well as highly desirable for other reasons. The work is one which private enterprise can not well undertake. It requires not only a large capital, but absolute control over the head waters of some of the principal streams of the country and of the region surrounding their sources. Individuals do not possess this, and there are objections to granting it to them.

The Government, however, can control and maintain it.—*Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press*.

The general subject is one of great importance. Minneapolis and the Northwest are interested in the proposition directly. The larger cultivation of the arid valleys by means of irrigation is sure to be of advantage, not only to the cities and towns in the irrigated districts, which would profit by the increased population and trade, but to the trade centers as well.—*Minneapolis Journal*.

The reclamation of arid lands is too vast in its scope and objects for private enterprise or even State aid. The Government must deal with the problem sooner or later. It alone can prevent a ruinous conflict of interests and conserve the oceans of water uselessly going to waste.—*North Yakima News*.

There is no greater necessity for the appropriation of money for the purpose of developing the rivers and harbors of the country than there is for the expenditure of a comparatively small amount of Government funds in aiding to bring water upon land that only needs its magic touch to make it fertile and provide new homes for citizens of the nation.—*Butte Miner*.

One of the greatest movements of the nineteenth century, one destined to find a successful issue in the early part of the twentieth. When this system becomes general throughout the arid lands of the West, the entire people of this country will share in the prosperous times they will produce. Thousands of home seekers will find homes for themselves and their families. The manufacturers of the East will find a large field for their products and will be enabled to employ more men. These men will consume more of the products of the Eastern farmer, and all in all every section and every industry will be greatly developed.—*Shreveport (La.) Times*.

This great work must be prosecuted until the last acre of land and sagebrush susceptible of irrigation is brought under the revivifying influence of water. The question may be asked, why not allow private capital to carry on the work which it has already commenced? The answer is that private persons can not control the sources of supply. Another and more convincing reason why the National Government should solve the problem, instead of leaving it to individuals and corporations, is that private enterprise has reached its limit. It has on the whole been a losing business. It has failed financially for reasons which would not be operative against the Government.—*New York Evening Post*.

This work, which is altogether too vast for private enterprise, it is expected the National Government will take hold of in the same way that it has spent such enormous sums in river and harbor improvement along the Atlantic seaboard. The immediate benefit, it is expected, will be to the West. In a broad way the benefit will be to the whole country.—*Denver Post*.

It is justly argued that the National Government and people outside the arid regions are interested in this movement by reason of the great value that would be added to public lands; the protection of the Mississippi and its tributaries from floods, and the vast additions to trade and commerce that will be secured by the upbuilding of the great West.—*Editorial correspondence, Evansville (Ind.) News*.

The first and most immediate benefits would result to agriculture in the use of the water to irrigate the arid lands of the far West. The second result would be the diverting of those flood waters from the Mississippi River, thereby relieving the lowlands of the valley from the inundations they periodically cause without such diversion. While Louisiana has a general interest in the improvement of the entire country, and in the promoting of its agriculture, this State's special interest is in the relief from floods from the great rivers that pour their waters down from the mountains upon the lowlands.—*New Orleans Picayune*.

The national irrigation movement is no longer an experiment. Its annual congresses have increased in size and importance for nine years. The object of carrying the conventions East is to awaken Eastern interest in the irrigation movement as something which, if successful, opens an extensive new market to Eastern manufacturers and jobbers.—*Topeka Capital*.

Slowly but surely the importance of a national system of irrigation is being impressed upon the United States Government. The great work being accomplished by irrigation associations, of which the National Irrigation Association is the strongest, will in time be the upbuilding of the arid West. The Government must and will, in a few short years, take hold of this important question.—*Paso Robles (Cal.) Record*.

One of the strongest points made in the Chicago irrigation convention in favor of Government assistance to irrigation was that it would promote the small-farm industry. The irrigated area is peculiarly adapted to small farms and unadapted to bonanza farming. Minnesota lands will not go a-begging whether the arid lands of the West are opened to settlement or not, and our

reservoir interests can well afford to join hands with the arid lands interests in securing such judicious Government aid as may be desired.—*Minneapolis Tribune*.

Both political parties have pledged their support to plans for reclaiming the arid lands of the West.

The last Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture says that private irrigation has practically reached its limit, and that in many instances it is proving a losing business. The reason for this failure would not exist in the case of Government operations. Eventually every possible acre of sand and sagebrush must be made productive.—*San Jose (Cal.) News*.

Private and State enterprise have already done much to develop the possibilities of some sections. But there are greater problems to be solved, and the members of the irrigation congress are doubtless right in holding that this is legitimate work for the United States Government itself. No one will object if the Government spends money to reclaim arid lands for the benefit of bona fide settlers.—*St. Joseph (Mo.) News*.

The irrigation problem is too large for individual initiation. It is a subject that should be handled by the Government.—*San Francisco Argonaut*.

"Save the forest and store the floods" bids fair to become a national motto at no distant day. The recent National Irrigation Congress in Chicago aroused a great deal of interest among people who have never before paid attention to forestry and irrigation matters.—*Los Angeles Herald*.

Probably no greater physical and economic problem is before the people of the United States at this time, and there probably is no other problem which will bring about such far-reaching and beneficial results when solved. Undoubtedly the next great internal improvement of the United States will be a plan for the reclamation of arid lands which will work harmoniously with the improvement of the great rivers.—*Findlay (Ohio) Republican*.

But the arid West must be reclaimed to settlement, not immediately, but eventually and most certainly. The reclamation of arid lands should be placed upon a similar basis with the improvement of our rivers and harbors, which are not put in a perfected state at once, but have work done on them every year and are regarded as fixed charges against the Government revenues. Reclamation must be made a consistent and persistent national policy.—*Fresno (Cal.) Republican*.

The irrigation question is not a sectional one. The East needs more agricultural lands in the West, that its surplus population may find homes. The whole country will be benefited by the increased productiveness of the West. The reclaimed arid lands will support railroads, furnish a market for manufactured products, and enable many thousands of Americans to establish homes.—*Minneapolis Times*.

There is no good reason assignable why the Government should not enter upon such work. It is interstate in character as river and harbor improvement. Indeed, in many cases such a system of reservoirs would have connection with river work. The impounding of surplus water during the winter would furnish a supply, not only for mining and irrigation, but perhaps for the improvement of navigation during dry seasons.—*San Jose Herald*.

The subject is one of vast importance, and one of these days, we have no doubt, will receive favorable consideration and money aid from the Government. Tens of thousands of farmers, settled upon small but productive farms, would add greatly by their labors to the agricultural products of the United States, and would be new, good customers of its manufacturers and merchants.—*Pittsburg Post*.

There are sufficient and satisfactory reasons for the undertaking of this great work of irrigation by the Federal Government. Private enterprise will undertake schemes that promise early financial returns, but will do little for the permanent benefit of mankind. This great work must be prosecuted until every barren waste of sand and sagebrush that is capable of irrigation is made to bloom and blossom like the rose, under the vivifying influence of water. It is gratifying to note in the Eastern press the assertion that the country will not be satisfied with anything less.—*Tacoma (Wash.) News*.

The power and duty of the Government to conserve the waters either by forests or reservoirs arise from the fact that upon their preservation depends the very existence of the country. With water we may have in the arid region prosperous communities, populous States and national wealth, resources and power; without water we have deserts, desolation, and death.—*Los Angeles Times*.

There is no doubt that any extensive plan for the reclamation of arid lands can be carried on to much better advantage by the General Government than by the States which have such lands within their borders. The benefits of so large an addition to the productive area of the country are apparent. Tens of thousands of farmers settled upon small but highly productive farms, would add greatly to the agricultural products of the United States and would be good customers of its manufacturers.—*Grand Rapids Herald*.

There is sufficient available water in Spain to reclaim an immense domain. The Government decided in May last to construct reservoirs and irrigation canals to enlarge her agricultural area. Certainly our country ought not to be behind poor, old, unenterprising Spain in bringing under cultivation her arid fields.—*Salt Lake Tribune*.

The necessity of doing something to reclaim arid lands has been slowly filtering through the minds of Western legislators for ten years or more. It is time they got together for a united attack upon the House and Senate committees that deal with internal improvements. There are enough Congressmen from the West, and their mentality and aggressiveness are of sufficiently high order to make a stir if they concentrate their energies.—*Spokane (Wash.) Review*.

The day is certainly coming when the public will realize the importance of further developing our land resources. Although the irrigation problem is an old one in many localities, it is comparatively new to the country as a whole. These lands, once reclaimed and provided with an adequate water supply, would become among the most fruitful and valuable in the country.—*Sioux City (Iowa) Times*.

What would be accomplished were the National Government to undertake the gigantic work of constructing reservoirs and canals on a scale necessary to bring the entire arid region under cultivation can best be judged from the transformation that has taken place where only a few years ago the lizard reigned almost supreme in his realm of burning desert. The platform (Irrigation Congress) recommends "adequate national legislation reserving control of the distribution of water for irrigation to the respective States and Territories." This should insure prompt action on any feasible plan that may be brought to the attention of Congress.—*Salt Lake City News*.

The project is one which would be of the very greatest benefit both to the West and the East—to the West as offering homes for not less than 10,000,000 people engaged in farming; to the East in supplying a large home market for manufactures of all kinds, and increasing to a very great extent the wealth and resources of our nation.—*Colorado Springs Gazette*.

Capt. H. M. Chittenden, of the Engineer Corps, who has made a careful study of the subject, asserts that there are in this country 75,000,000 acres of arid land which can be reclaimed. This is a territory somewhat larger than New England and New York together. Considering the great fertility of irrigated lands, it will readily be seen that this reclaimed territory would support millions of people, and be a vast addition to the national wealth and resources.—*Boston Herald*.

There is involved in this problem of national irrigation development vastly more than a mere problem of redeeming a few farms from the wilderness.—*Nebraska Farmer*.

No more necessitous or beneficial work can employ the attention of the Government than a comprehensive scheme of irrigation for the West. The building of jetties and the banking up of the Mississippi are not more strictly within the province of the Federal power.—*Olean (N. Y.) Times*.

Irrigation must be made a great national problem, and the nation must develop a policy to meet the conditions. In short, the Government must undertake the reclamation of the arid region.—*Omaha News*.

Every city, every State, and every trade organization should at once take up the question of urging the construction of storage reservoirs upon their members of Congress.—*Interstate Manufacturer*.

Such important works as storage reservoirs should be built by the Government as internal improvements and permanently maintained. This would give absolute assurance of safety to communities farming the lands below them. Without such a guaranty of stability the inherent fear of the settler in reservoir systems can not be overcome, for the irrigator is always at the mercy of the reservoir.—*Olathe (Kans.) Patron*.

The manufacturers of the country, especially the East, now that their attention has been called to the subject, are becoming heartily in favor of the plan of Federal aid to irrigation, because of the promise that the development and population of these now arid lands means the establishment of a great home market for their goods. Their friendliness and aid will be found not inconsiderable.—*Irrigation Age (Chicago, Ill.)*.

The area of the arid lands is estimated to be at least 500,000,000 acres. The reclamation of these lands would add billions of dollars of wealth to the country.—*New York Journal*.

Congress has taken tentative but inefficient steps to aid irrigation, granting the lands to the States which find themselves unable to bear the burden involved in a large system of irrigation. Money can not be raised on them to improve them, but must be invested before they have any value. Every argument that has been made for other national improvements appeals with greater force for this.—*St. Paul Dispatch*.

It is proposed to ask an appropriation of ten millions per annum on a "continuous plan," as is recognized in the river and harbor work. For ourselves, we think the possession and occupation of "arid America" more likely to "expand our trade and give us greater strength among the nations" than the acquisition of all China.—*Jacksonville (Fla.) Times Union*.

The benefit of a comprehensive system of Government irrigation works to the arid West can hardly be underestimated.—*Denver Stockman*.

The irrigation congress has intrenched itself upon the broad principle that it is the duty of the National Government to take care of the arid lands, and it will make a vigorous—though not necessarily a last ditch—fight to have Congress shoulder the burden.—*Kansas City (Mo.) Journal*.

The question of the reclamation of millions of acres of Western lands by irrigation is no longer a sectional issue; it is a national one. It is time that the subject should receive that attention its importance demands.

The reservoir system will prove the solution of this problem, while mitigating floods in the Missouri and Mississippi rivers.

It is a national enterprise and should be so considered.

It is legitimately the work of Congress. That body should attend to it.—*St. Louis Chronicle*.

When it (The National Irrigation Congress) gets what it wants the desert lands of the West will disappear and the floods in the Mississippi will cease and the rain belt will widen.—*Brooklyn Eagle*.

The reclamation of the arid lands of the West and the conservation of the forests is the most important movement for Western interests which could possibly be undertaken. If carried to a successful consummation, it would mean thousands of new settlers in our Western States and a phenomenal growth of population, increased land values, and augmented political importance.—*Farmington (Wash.) Times*.

The wise men of the East can not yet understand that the need of the people in the West is just as great as those along the seashores of the Atlantic States. They are still too narrow-minded to appreciate the fact that the West has claims that must sooner or later be recognized. We will have to be patient a little longer.—*Saratoga (Wyo.) Sun*.

The river and harbor bill carried with it an appropriation of \$60,000,000 for the improvement of our rivers and harbors, but not one cent for the construction of reservoirs in the arid West. Such blind egotism is exasperating, but we will have to endure it for a time, at least, until some of the gross and misinformation and misconception about this Western country can be leveled away and the importance of the arid question brought to bear on the minds of the effete East.—*Laramie (Wyo.) Times*.

In his last annual report the Secretary of the Interior estimated that the arid land of the West, if properly reclaimed, would support a population of no less than 50,000,000. Other reports say that with irrigation the waste lands would be worth at least \$500,000,000. This figure may be far from accurate, but the fact is plain that the value of such lands would be enormous. Both national parties approved in their last platforms national legislation to reclaim the arid lands.—*Auburn (N. Y.) Advertiser*.

The magic touch of water will work this transformation. The conservation of the water supplies must therefore be first accomplished. The forests, which are nature's storage reservoirs, must be preserved, and the waters that now go to waste in destructive floods must be stored in great reservoirs and saved for beneficial use. The National Government is the only agency through which this can be accomplished.—*Carson City (Nev.) Appeal*.

Congress will go ahead appropriating millions every session for flood prevention without a question, but it will not appropriate the same amount for a plan which, according to the Government's own engineers, promises far greater results. Of course the storing of the reservoirs would mean the reclamation of large tracts of land to irrigation, but this need not worry Congress, even its Eastern members, for the Eastern merchants are already alive to the situation and realize that the reclamation of the arid West would open to them the finest market in the world.—*Compton (Cal.) Enterprise*.

The progressive spirit of the nation demands that its arid lands be reclaimed. With the forces now at work it is only a question of a few years until this is done.—*Spokane Trade*.

Slowly, but surely, the importance of a national system of irrigation is being impressed upon the United States Government. Thousands of acres of the most productive land in the West lie a waste owing to a lack of moisture. Settlers would flock to this new domain were it made fertile by supplying sufficient moisture. The Government must and will in a few short years take hold of this important question.—*Paso Robles (Cal.) Record*.

Every dollar expended by the National Government for the building of storage reservoirs and great irrigation works to reclaim the millions of acres of Western aridity will return to the Federal Treasury six to one in the form of increased taxes on increased land values and population. Every Congressman knows this, now that his attention is being called to the subject by Eastern manufacturers who want a larger market in the West for their goods, and all that is required for his favorable action is a strong and aggressive demand from every Western State and Territory and Congressional district.

In Arizona, New Mexico, Montana, California, and all other sections where Uncle Sam owns vast sections of arid lands he could well afford to develop it by a system of wells, pumping stations, tanks, and general reservoirs.—*Albion (Cal.) Mercury*.

The importance of Western arid-land reclamation is shown by the continuous press reports of the actions of various business and commercial organizations indorsing the national irrigation movement and urging the reclamation of the arid region. The recent action of the executive committee of the National Business League of Chicago, whose membership represents tens of millions, is an example. Strong resolutions were adopted urging upon Congress the preservation and development of national resources by the construction of storage reservoirs by the Federal Government for flood protection and to save for use in aid of navigation and irrigation the flood waters which now run to waste and cause overflow and destruction, and for the reclamation of the arid public lands.—*Rio Vista (Cal.) News*.

The irrigation congress has assumed a national character, and the building of great Federal storage reservoirs would reclaim hundreds of acres where now single acres are reclaimed by private capital.—*Cottage Grove (Oreg.) Nugget*.

To anyone who has seen the hundreds of thousands of acres of arid land and the natural advantages for storing the flood waters that as a rule surround them, the efforts in behalf of this important matter will be appreciated.

The storage of flood waters in some sections of this State will not only reclaim miles and miles of tillable land, but will be the greatest boon to mining interests this State ever had.—*Redondo (Cal.) Breeze*.

There is crying need for action on the part of the Congress of the United States that will result in the irrigation of the arid deserts of the West. Everyone who has traveled to the far West must have seen evidences of the wonderful fertility of the irrigated lands. Within a quarter of a century irrigation will be used all over this country.—*Cincinnati Public School Journal*.

The national movement in favor of irrigation has become broad and popular, and Eastern manufacturers and business men generally seem to have at last awakened to the fact that the reclaiming and populating of the arid regions of the West will largely increase the home market for their goods, and thus add very materially to their own prosperity and that of the nation.—*Pacific Grove (Cal.) Review*.

Too much attention can not be given to the all-important question of irrigation on a broad plan. It is the great need of the times. By the establishment of a great irrigation system such as that proposed by the National Irrigation Congress, millions of our citizens could establish homes throughout the great West where industry would be abundantly rewarded by the bestowal of thrift and contentment upon a prosperous people.—*Oakdale (Cal.) Leader*.

The matter of reclaiming the arid sections of the West has been agitated for a long time and the idea has gained rapidly in public favor. The conquest of the desert means a great deal to these United States, and Congress must at no distant day see and appreciate the advantage of national legislation in the matter. The building of Federal storage reservoirs would reclaim thousands of acres where now single acres are reclaimed by private capital. It has been well said that the key to Western prosperity is water.—*Fortuna (Cal.) Advance*.

During the past two years the question of irrigation and irrigation surveys has been forced to the front, and it is now recognized as one which must be reckoned upon by chairmen of committees at each session of Congress, and which can not be suppressed or pigeonholed. The National Irrigation Association has done and is doing effective work in furthering the cause of internal development in the Great West, and is deserving of every encouragement and support. When, as in the proposed congress at Chicago, the most influential and brainy men of the nation meet and lift their voices in behalf of the cause, it is a force which can not be resisted for long and is certain to give results.—*Riverside (Cal.) Enterprise*.

The first and most immediate benefits would result to agriculture in the use of the water to irrigate the arid lands of the far West. The second result would be the diverting of those flood waters from the Mississippi River, thereby relieving the lowlands of the valley from the inundations they periodically cause without such diversion. While Louisiana has a general interest in the improvement of the entire country, and in the promoting of its agriculture, this State's special interest is in the relief from floods from the great rivers that pour their waters down from the mountains upon the lowlands.—*Bayard (Neb.) Transcript*.

It would be worth more to this country to render that land fit for farming purposes than it would be to annex Canada or Mexico, or a big slice of China. Much, if not all, of it can be reclaimed by a proper system of irrigation. The further work of reclamation must be done through Governmental action. Congress has appropriated liberally to the geological survey, for the special purpose of having the feasibility of irrigation and the best methods of accomplishing it thoroughly investigated.—*Louisville Commercial*.

Western men in Congress are pushing irrigation plans and we have no criticism to offer for their course, because an adequate water supply is of more importance than any other one thing for Western people. If successful irrigation can be secured either from reservoirs or from wells it will be a source of congratulation.—*Omaha Nonconformist*.

Throughout the arid region land without water is of little value; the rivers on which its fertility depends are the main features of Western development. In view of the fact that the General Government controls the public land and the States control the water supply, the congress is desirous of having a union of the two elements under the control of the States, and, therefore, it has been working to that end ever since the first session, ten years ago. Such are the hopes of the arid West.—*Logan (Utah) Journal*.

Colorado business men recognize the benefit that attaches to their State through the work of the Government along the lines of irrigation investigation and surveys for reservoir sites. The Denver Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade last month adopted vigorous resolutions calling attention to the great development possible in Colorado through irrigation, and to the generally accepted opinion that only by the storage of flood waters can the future problem affecting successful farming in the arid region be solved, and pledging support to the United States Geological Survey in securing large Congressional appropriations for carrying on their work for surveys of reservoir sites and other preliminary irrigation work.—*Caldwell (Kans.) Advance*.

One thing seems certain, that the Government should take the lead in irrigation management of any large sort. Many of the streams used for irrigation are interstate; in many and perhaps most cases their head waters are on Government land. State laws are often inadequate and ineffective, while they differ widely and should be harmonized under national supervision, or, better, the whole subject should be turned over to the national control, except in those cases where all phases of an irrigation problem are within the confines and province of one State.—*American Lumberman*.

The engineers claim that an expenditure of \$150,000,000 will not only provide water for reclaiming all the irrigable land in the West, furnish homes for at least 50,000,000 more people, but will put an end to the disastrous spring floods that devastate the Mississippi and Missouri valleys every year, and will render unnecessary the expenditure of large sums annually by the Government building levees.

The movement is to be a movement of business men in the interest of building up the West and making homes for a larger population.—*Dixie (Colo.) Falcon*.

The motto of the Congress will be "Save the forests and store the floods." The manufacturing and business interests of the East have been quick to see their advantage in the general reclamation of the West, and they will be well represented.—*Placerville (Cal.) Nugget*.

The National Irrigation Congress, which will meet in Chicago, is creating wide interest and promises to be an unusual success. The national irrigation movement has become a broad, popular movement, and eastern commercial interests have readily taken hold of the idea of reclaiming and populating the arid West, and thus creating a great home market for their goods.—*Howard (S. Dak.) Press*.

The people of the well-watered States should have a great deal of sympathy for those in the arid regions of the great West; but we in the lowlands of the Mississippi Valley have in addition a direct interest in their efforts to secure national aid in storing up the excessive waters of the Western rivers, to be used in irrigating regions now too dry for any of the purposes of agriculture, but which if properly watered would be among the most fruitful.—*Solomonsville (Ariz.) Bulletin*.

C. B. Booth, of Los Angeles, has been doing a little missionary work among the business men of the East. He is greatly encouraged over the outlook and says:

"In attempting to spread the gospel of national irrigation in the East, I was almost swept off my feet by the interest I found among Eastern people of whom I buy my goods. Many of them are well informed of the work and are anxious to see a policy of national irrigation adopted. An Eastern man who sells goods in the West can see in an instant what benefit it would be to him if millions of acres of Western land were transformed from a desert into fertility."—*Santa Paula (Cal.) Chronicle*.

Every dollar expended by the National Government for the building of storage reservoirs and great irrigation works to reclaim the millions of acres of Western aridity will return to the Federal Treasury six to one in the form of increased taxes on increased land values and population. Every Congressman knows this, now that his attention is being called to the subject by Eastern manufacturers, who want a larger market in the West for their goods, and all that is required for his favorable action is a strong and aggressive demand from every Western State and Territory and Congressional district.—*Bridgeport (Cal.) Chronicle*.

This national irrigation question has enlisted the interest of Eastern commercial circles to a large degree, and they have taken hold of the idea of reclaiming and populating what is known as the "Arid West," and thus creating a greater home market for their goods. Such a system of irrigation would be worth millions to the Pacific States alone.—*Bossburg (Wash.) Journal*.

The movement is highly commendable, and if it should be found practicable to store the mountain floods, especially during the season of heavy rains, not only can millions of acres of desert Western lands be made to blossom, but the States of the Mississippi Valley can be saved from the disastrous results of excessive floods.—*Macon Telegraph*.

The national irrigation congress which meets at Chicago November 21, 22, 23, and 24, is creating wide interest and promises to be an unusual success. We do not know that any cities in this section will be represented, but it is safe to say that all will sympathize with the effort to add to the commercial value and social importance of the great section of Western country now withheld from rapid development by remediable aridity.—*Scranton (Pa.) Tribune*.

The building of great Federal storage reservoirs would reclaim hundreds of acres where now single acres are reclaimed by private capital.—*Anaheim (Cal.) Gazette*.

The movement is for national assistance to secure construction of reservoirs, to preserve the forests at the heads of the streams, and to make it possible to bring large areas of new country under the plow.—*Wardner (Idaho) News*.

The national irrigation congress is fortunate in holding this session in the East, for, as never before, the opportunity is presented to educate the people east of the Mississippi to the fact that there is a possibility of creating in this Western country homes for millions, and that it is the right and duty of the Government to carry out the work.—*Chico (Cal.) Enterprise*.

Everybody agrees that the future welfare of a great part of the country depends upon preserving our magnificent forests and water sheds, which in most cases are sources of water supply, and the national irrigation movement has pushed forward into such prominence as to be the subject of planks in the national platforms of both the great political parties.—*Salem (Oreg.) Homestead*.

The opponents of Federal irrigation admit that it is quite proper for the Government to appropriate money for the construction of expensive riprap and levees for floods to destroy from time to time in addition to causing vast loss to life and private property; yet that it is wholly wrong to build reservoirs to restrain these floods and thus get at the root of the evil, because the water stored in these reservoirs would be used to irrigate parched fields, and thus we would be adding too much to our productive capacity. Fortunately the adherents to this narrow proposition are not numerous and the theory is not growing in popularity.—*Honcut (Cal.) Times*.

The national irrigation movement is now one of such importance that it was a subject of platform planks with both the great parties in this campaign.—*Helena Independent*.

Just how far the Government can or should go in this work it is not this paper's province to say; but that the Government may and should encourage and aid in this great work, it is only reasonable and patriotic to suggest.—*Portland (Oreg.) Telegram*.

Many Eastern business concerns and organizations are showing a disposition to support a movement looking to the reclamation by the Government of the arid lands of the West through the construction of mountain storage reservoirs, thus affording a home market for manufactures.—*Alturas (Cal.) Plaindealer*.

Eastern commercial interests have readily taken hold of the idea of reclaiming and populating the arid West and creating a great home market for their goods.—*Milton (Oreg.) Eagle*.

As the population of the country increases, and available agricultural lands are taken up for settlement and improvement, the problem of irrigation steadily gains in importance. Vast tracts of arid land that were formerly considered valueless may be so reclaimed by irrigation that they become veritable garden spots of great fertility.—*Minneapolis Progress*.

The national irrigation movement has pushed forward into such prominence as to be the subject of planks in the national platforms of both the great political parties. It will be a surprise to some people to know how many public men are taking a deep interest in the problem of the reclamation of the arid West, which, if the waters which now run into waste were stored by the Government and used for irrigation, would be transformed into tens of thousands of small but highly productive farms.—*Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Republic*.

The key to Western prosperity is plenty of water, and the Congress of the United States practically controls the question of water development. The building of great Federal storage reservoirs would reclaim hundreds of acres

where now single acres are reclaimed by private enterprise.—*Salida (Colo.) Mail*.

Through the vigorous and concerted demands of the newspapers of the arid region, during the past two years, the question of irrigation and irrigation surveys has been forced to the front, and it is now recognized as one which must be reckoned upon by chairmen of committees at each session of Congress, and which can not be suppressed or pigeonholed. This state of affairs is primarily the result of newspaper agitation, and the newspapers of the West now hold the key to an irrigation development which would be nothing less than a conquest of the desert.—*Cripple Creek (Colo.) Times*.

The Congress of the United States practically controls the question of water development. The building of great Federal storage reservoirs would reclaim hundreds of acres where now single acres are reclaimed by private capital. The business men of the East are taking a great interest in the matter, and it is thought that something may be accomplished before long. Let everyone do what he can to aid in this work.—*Waterville (Wash.) Empire*.

The National Irrigation Association has the matter in hand and is striving hard to bring the subject forward as the one greatest and most important question now before the country. A good representative Western attendance is hoped for, as the occasion presents an opportunity for exceptional benefit to that half of the United States.—*Oakdale (Cal.) Enquirer*.

History shows that it has been in the irrigated regions of the earth that not only the densest but more highly civilized population have found their homes. The great valleys of the West, if properly reclaimed, offer boundless possibilities.—*Winemucca (Nev.) Silver State*.

The success of this convention is a wish near the heart of every resident of the Mississippi Valley and the great agricultural West. Its proceedings will be followed with deep interest.—*Burlington Hawkeye*.

The National Irrigation Congress promises to be an unusual success. The national irrigation movement has become a broad popular movement and Eastern commercial interests have readily taken hold of the idea of reclaiming and populating the arid West and thus creating a great home market for their goods.—*New Whatcom (Wash.) Reveille*.

Chicago wholesale merchants are taking a genuine interest in the proposition to reclaim the West, and thereby increase its population fifty million, and the work of the congress will be directed toward placing before the business interests of the West the trade possibilities which lie in the reclamation of some seventy-five million acres of arid land, whose fertility has lain dormant for hundreds of centuries, waiting only the touch of water to make it as productive as the valley of the Nile.—*Junata (Neb.) Herald*.

Tremendous efforts are being made by those interested in the question of irrigation and forest preservation to have every section of the country represented at the National Irrigation Congress which meets in Chicago on the 21st instant. The aim and object of the officers of the congress is to unite the East and the West in one grand combined effort to awaken the entire country to a realization of the incalculable national benefits which will result from the reclamation of the great arid regions of the West and its settlement with a prosperous population.—*Pacific Grove (Cal.) Review*.

The great problem of the reclamation of the millions of arid acres was recognized at its true value and the incalculable benefits to result appreciated. The national standing of the national irrigation question is an assured fact.—*Dospatos (Cal.) Star*.

It looks as though the time ought to be now ripe for the West to take a firm stand on the question of national irrigation, and something great may be accomplished at once.—*Heppner (Oreg.) Gazette*.

The irrigation congress has assumed a truly national character, and the programme which has been prepared for this session will attract wide attention. Chicago is a great business center, and the opportunity is a splendid one to present to the business people and interests of the country the entire problem of land and water.—*Enid (Okla.) Wave*.

The ninth annual session of the National Irrigation Congress, which this year meets in Chicago, promises to be of exceptional interest and importance to the West. This is the first session of the congress which was held in any city east of the Missouri River, and it should be well represented by Western men.—*South Omaha Tribune*.

Great as is Chicago, with her people equaling in numbers a third of the entire population of the western half of the United States, yet the National Irrigation Congress was recognized as the exponent of a national movement and caused no little local and general comment. Chicago newspapers devoted their columns to its meetings and Chicago's largest business men attended them. The great problem of the reclamation of the millions of arid acres was recognized at its true value and the incalculable benefits to result appreciated. The national standing of the national irrigation question is an assured fact.—*Nogales (Ariz.) Vidette*.

The national irrigation movement has become a broad, popular movement, and Eastern commercial interests have readily taken hold of the idea of reclaiming and populating the arid West, and thus creating a great home market for their goods.—*Yerington (Nev.) Monitor*.

Whatever are her possibilities, it is not contended that the West is as important or influential as the East. She has not yet the dense population. But why should she not get at least a fair share of this great appropriation to be applied to the building of great storage reservoirs to be filled with flood waters for use in irrigation, under a system of internal improvements?—*Templeton (Cal.) Advance*.

The Western delegates went home feeling that they have the hearty support of Eastern interests in securing action which will open to settlement a half a continent, capable of supporting 50,000,000 people. They can not but feel that this support is growing; that it is developing into a great movement; that many people are realizing that national action would meet such a Western development as would increase the national wealth beyond measure.—*Kern City (Cal.) Standard*.

The time seems to be ripe for the realization of the aims of those public-spirited, far-sighted, and progressive men who year after year have met in national convention and sought by all manner of means to arouse public sentiment to the utility and necessity of national action in reclaiming the arid lands of the West by means of reservoirs for the storage of the surplus waters of the great rivers that drain the Mississippi and Missouri valleys.—*Bozeman (Mont.) Chronicle*.

Instead of finding opposition in the East, the irrigation congress found that Eastern men of prominence were more than interested in a proposition which promised an increased Western population of millions of people.—*Tuba City (Cal.) Independent*.

The time seems fully ripe for the West to take a firm and decided stand on the question of national irrigation, and something great may be accomplished at once. Why not? It is right.—*Gridley (Cal.) Herald*.

They have the hearty support of Eastern interests in securing action which will open to settlement a half a continent, capable of supporting 50,000,000 people. They can not but feel that this support is growing; that it is developing into a great movement; that many people are realizing that national action would meet such a Western development as would increase the national wealth beyond measure.—*Great Falls (Mont.) News*.

The building of vast storage reservoirs would obviate the necessity for much river expenditure and would help navigation, and the home building

area of the United States would be vastly increased.—*Raton (N. Mex.) Reporter*.

Every Western paper is interested in seeing this development accomplished. Eastern merchants are more than willing to see such an undertaking. The West should take the initiative.—*Wells (Nev.) Star-Herald*.

It is the opinion at Washington that \$40,000,000 will be appropriated by this Congress for river and harbor improvements. Of this, the western half of the United States will get, judging by previous records, a couple of millions or so. It is not contended that the West is as important or influential as the East. She has not yet the dense population; but why should she not get at least a fair share of this great appropriation? Why should she not get a fourth of it, to be applied to the building of great storage reservoirs to be filled with flood waters for use in irrigation, under a system of internal improvements?—*Carlsbad (N. Mex.) Argus*.

The Government is spending large sums in aiding in the development of foreign trade and the opening of foreign markets for American manufacturers. It is believed that we should push our goods into every market of the world and sell them. The belief is also gaining ground that the Government should also develop its home market for American products and manufacturers.—*California Cultivator*.

If this great enterprise could be carried out with the aid and ownership of the Government and not be allowed to be gobbled up and fall under the control of syndicates and trusts, and remain under the ownership and management of the Government, it would be an unmeasured benefit to the States and the homeless people.—*Ottawa (Kans.) Republican*.

It is as right that Congress should appropriate money for storage reservoirs as for river and harbor improvements. The building of storage reservoirs would obviate the necessity for much river expenditure and would help navigation, and the home building area would be vastly increased. And now if the West makes the demand the East will back it up, for the benefit would not be local.—*Fort Pierre (S. Dak.) Fairplay*.

The great prominence given to the meetings of the National Irrigation Congress at Chicago and other influences have shown to thoughtful members of both Houses of Congress that this irrigation question is something that has to be settled with, and that there is no use in trying to think it can be indefinitely put off.—*Arapahoe (Neb.) Pioneer*.

What Congress has to guard against is schemes to benefit mere private enterprise at public expense. The Government should control the distribution and settlement of land reclaimed, to permit its people everywhere to share in the advantages to be provided. A project so guarded will be beneficial, and the people of every section of the country can consistently approve of it.—*Biggs (Cal.) Notes*.

As the Government is appropriating vast sums of money for the opening up of foreign markets and development of foreign trade, and spending freely on river and harbor improvements, it would seem that the next step would be to prepare greater room for our increasing population here at home. When once shown that a scheme of reclaiming our vast waste areas by irrigation is feasible, the people will be willing enough to see the proposition backed up financially by the Government.—*Newberg (Oreg.) Graphic*.

It means the loosening of the tension now held on the human race, because there is no place to emigrate to. When there was a great public domain and men could go West and get them a home, there was a freedom in life which does not now exist, but which would again return with the realization of national irrigation.

Speed the day when Congress shall turn loose the possibilities of the undeveloped West.—*Antelope Valley (Cal.) Gazette*.

It is well known that there are vast tracts of land in regions of the United States now untenable and of no value because of a lack of water supply. It is also well known that all of this land is susceptible of cultivation and profitable occupancy if it be successfully irrigated by the creation of storage reservoirs and conduits. We have for illustration of this fact the example of the hated Mormons who made the desert blossom with roses by just such a method. It is well known not only that private capital can not be attracted to this measure, but that the results will be of greater public than private benefit.—*Trenton (N. J.) American*.

Mr. Bryan, in his late campaign, called attention to the fact that a small part of the money spent in the Philippines would provide ways to irrigate the arid regions of the West, and thus open up a far better territory for all kinds of commerce and agriculture than can be hoped for in the Philippines. Now that the election is over all are willing to admit the truth of this, and the Government will be urged to bring about improved conditions. On this subject Thomas B. Reed says: "Mighty as has been our past, our resources have just been touched upon, and there is wealth beyond the Mississippi which, in the not distant future, will be astonishing."—*St. Joseph (Mo.) Fruit Grower*.

It is going to take time to educate Congress to the vast importance of irrigation, and to the real necessity of the work to be undertaken by the National Government. When that education has progressed, as it will, to a knowledge of the subject, then the work will be commenced. And, once commenced, the work will be continuously carried on to a successful and triumphant conclusion.—*Redlands (Cal.) Citigraph*.

The subject of such development concerns the far East, too, as the prosperity of any part of this great country affects beneficially every other part.—*Salem (Oreg.) Homestead*.

If reclaimed and brought into production, this great area would support anywhere from 50,000,000 to 60,000,000 of people in great comfort. It will, in reality, be a great advantage to all the manufacturing States to contribute toward a new settlement of the West, and thus extend the demand for manufactured goods. Neither will such a reclamation of the desert be accomplished in a day. It will be like the improvement of the Columbia or Mississippi, a policy for a generation.—*Astoria (Oreg.) News*.

Irrigation would transform this half of the continent. It would make the west productive far beyond anything ever attained in the past. Rational plans executed with economy would do more for the West than any party could do working through purely political means. In the East there is a sentiment which favors the plans of the irrigators and will materially further plans for reclamation of the West.—*Burns (Oreg.) Times-Herald*.

The question of national irrigation is attracting considerable attention, and something in that line will be accomplished sooner or later. It is as right that Congress should appropriate money for a system of storage reservoirs as for military expansion and foreign invasion.—*Huntsville Enterprise*.

The reclaiming of arid lands by such a system, according to the engineers, would eventually furnish homes for 40,000,000 people where now the population is of the scantiest. Opportunity would again be afforded young men to secure farms when making their start in life, and a great addition would be made to the agricultural population, on which the prosperity of the country so largely depends. This new farming community would increase the market for manufactured goods and would largely add to the agricultural wealth of the land. For both these reasons the East as well as the West is interested in the irrigation development.—*Sedalia (Mo.) Capital*.

Among other matters which will be brought to the attention of Congress are several schemes for the benefit of the arid West. To irrigate and therefore to render fertile large districts in the mountain States and those lying

mostly on the great central plateau has been proven to be a possibility.—*Christian Advocate* (St. Louis).

The people of the West are commencing to wake up on the subject of irrigation, and before the winter is over the whole country will be clamoring at Congress to do something to start the good work of reclaiming the arid lands of the West.—*Carlsbad* (N. Mex.) *Argus*.

In these sections irrigation is essential if there be any production, and much has been accomplished in the way of making these deserts blossom as the rose. This congress of men is designed to awaken public interest in behalf of the public. The demands are worthy.—*Beardstown* (Ill.) *Star*.

The Secretary of the Interior is of the opinion that 50,000,000 people can live comfortably on lands now desolate for want of water, and nothing is more remarkable than the fertility of such lands when water is applied to them regularly. They will be made habitable sometime when other good land is not so available as at present. The whole country needs a bit of education about both irrigation and its kindred subject, fertility.—*Elmira* (N. Y.) *Advertiser*.

There are about 75,000,000 acres of arid land now uninhabitable, which, if provided with proper water supplies, would support 100,000,000 people. The project is too great for private capital. While the Government is expanding beyond the old boundaries, the development within our own territory is much more necessary. There is an abundance of water if the proper reservoirs are constructed.—*Albany* (Ill.) *Journal*.

The national irrigation movement is no longer an experiment. Its annual congresses have increased in size and importance for nine years. The object of carrying the conventions East is to awaken Eastern interest in the irrigation movement as something which if successful opens an extensive new market to Eastern manufacturers and jobbers. Already the support of some of the largest business men in Chicago has been enlisted in irrigation.—*Topeka Capital*.

As the Government controls rivers, it could appropriately undertake the diversion of superfluous water in the winter and early spring into reservoirs where it could be stored until it should be needed in the spring and summer. The Government is the more interested in such work because it would probably end the floods that have caused such loss of life and property. The whole country should insist on a thorough examination of the scheme by Congress. If it proves at all feasible, it must then be carried out.—*Fort Smith* (Ark.) *Times*.

Engineers are planning great reservoirs in the far West for the storage of water to irrigate "the arid lands." But unless the congress turns its strength toward preventing the further despoliation and forest denudation of the Rocky Mountain and Sierra ranges, there will soon be no water supply for the reservoirs when constructed.—*Scranton* (Pa.) *Truth*.

There are those who fear that the reclamation of this land will result in the overproduction of farm products. This, however, is a false alarm, growing out of the false economic principle emphasized in the recent political campaigns for political purposes only. The development of other industries in the great West will keep pace with agricultural development, and will thus increase the demand in ratio with the supply. The mountains of the West team with coal and minerals, the development and manufacture of which will keep pace with the development of agriculture, while the rapidly growing Oriental trade will afford another outlet.—*Chicago National Rural*.

Col. H. B. Maxson, secretary of the congress, expresses the hope that the meeting will result in causing the East as well as the West to take a deep interest in the subject to be considered. Certainly it is one of the most important questions now demanding attention.—*Battle Creek* (Mich.) *Journal*.

Much is expected from the National Irrigation Congress, which meets next week at Chicago. The United States still owns about a million square miles of arid land, much of which is capable of cultivation if irrigated.—*Sparta* (Wis.) *Democrat*.

This is a territory somewhat larger than New England and New York together. Considering the great fertility of irrigated lands, it will readily be seen that this reclaimed territory would support millions of people and be a vast addition to the national wealth and resources. The sum of \$150,000,000 appears to be a large one, but the expenditure would not come at all once. Probably \$10,000,000 a year is as much as could profitably be used.—*New England Farmer*.

But so vast an enterprise would be only possible for the General Government itself. The present movement will without doubt so impress Congress that it may confidently be expected that that body will soon be heard earnestly discussing the ways and means for utilizing the waste waters of the Rockies and of the rivers for the redeeming and rendering highly valuable much of the lands of the region named.—*Wichita* (Kans.) *Eagle*.

There has never been a stronger sentiment in the country than at present favorable to Congressional legislation for the promotion of irrigation. The question of Government aid in conserving the flood waters of the arid regions for irrigation purposes has long been discussed, and although Congress has not been well disposed toward the idea the friends of irrigation are not willing to give it up.—*Maryville* (Mo.) *Republican*.

As the Government controls rivers, it could appropriately undertake the diversion of superfluous water in the winter and early spring into reservoirs where it could be stored until it should be needed in the spring and summer. The Government is the more interested in such work because it would probably end the floods that have caused such loss of life and property. The water which now swells the Missouri and Mississippi to undue proportions at times would be diverted for use in transforming deserts into gardens.—*Grand Forks* (N. Dak.) *Herald*.

The irrigation congress to meet at Chicago this week has an ambitious project on hand. The leaders of the movement propose a vast system of irrigation conduits and storage reservoirs in certain arid regions of the West whereby they estimate that 100,000,000 acres of land now unproductive can be reclaimed and transformed into flourishing farms.—*Rutland* (Vt.) *Herald*.

No matter where established these reservoirs and irrigation ditches would afford a source of supply to the natural elements that go toward the distribution of water in rain, and other parts of the country than those directly tributary to the reservoirs would be benefited.—*Norfolk News*.

A recent hearing before the Public Lands Committee indicates that the interest in the question of irrigation is rapidly taking a shape which will demand action by Congress. If the fertile parts of the national domain have been exhausted, it becomes a question whether it is not good policy for Government to provide that element for its waste lands which experience has shown to be the only factor lacking in the insurance of great farming value. Irrigation surveys have been extensively made from time to time in the mountainous area of the West, and they have sufficiently shown that ample water storage is practicable for the purpose even in the most arid regions. Of course it is primarily requisite that the United States should control the watersheds and sources of supply if it is to undertake the great task before it. This it will be far easier for the General Government to do than for States to achieve.—*Newark* (N. J.) *News*.

There is to be a movement in Congress to secure appropriations for storage reservoirs in the West. The idea underlying this plan is good; storage reservoirs will be needed, and steps should be taken looking to their construction.—*Boise* (Idaho) *Statesman*.

Millions of acres of now arid lands will yet be made to yield abundant har-

vests by means of irrigation—and the sooner Congress takes the preliminary steps to this end the better. The water rights of the semiarid belts are already rapidly falling into the hands of speculators whose extortionate demands will soon impede Government action.—*Socorro* (N. Mex.) *Chieftain*.

During the last ten years the United States has expended nearly one half million dollars in making surveys, ascertaining the amount of rainfall, and gathering other necessary data, from what is known as our arid sections, with a view of inaugurating a Governmental plan of irrigation.—*Willows* (Cal.) *Promoter*.

Like many other subjects, irrigation has broadened. Investigation has shown that it is to day a national question, as the whole nation would be benefited by the reclamation of the vast arid tracts of land in the far West. Of course there are narrow-minded Congressmen just as there are narrow-minded people everywhere. These are inclined to think that the upbuilding of the arid regions would interfere with the prosperity of their own States; that it would cause an overproduction, and that prices in general would be lessened.

These men have yet to learn that the country is continually growing, and that as the products increase the demand for these products will increase by the same ratio.—*Walla Walla Union*.

The necessary work is of so expensive and, indeed, so public a character that it probably belongs to the duties of the General Government. Private individuals can not carry out so great a project, not so much from lack of capital as because of the difficulty of acquiring the lands, a difficulty which the Government would or should not allow to be overcome by private individuals, because the result would then be a great private monopoly of the irrigated lands, to the enrichment and benefit of a few people instead of the many.—*Clarkston* (Wash.) *Journal*.

The great problem of the reclamation of the nation's millions of arid acres is beginning to be recognized at its true value. The enormous benefits to result are commencing to be appreciated. The irrigation question is one that in the not distant future is destined to cut quite an important figure in national legislation and the appropriations of the Government for needed improvements.—*Spokane* (Wash.) *Trade*.

It is a business proposition that is presented, not only for Uncle Sam but for the merchants of the country, adding to the American market as no other enterprise and as no war or purchase can add, for our home market is the best market in the world, and irrigated lands provide at once the most producers and the most consumers. The Government will soon be committed to this policy of internal development, by far the most important in its history.—*Modesto* (Cal.) *Herald*.

Comprehensively and crudely stated, the plan is to utilize the deep mountain snows, through great reservoirs and hundreds of miles of canals, for irrigating the barren plains and lowlands. That this can be done on a large scale there seems to be no doubt. Should the Government undertake the work? And if it should, can it be induced to do so? And if so, can it be carried on in the interest of millions of people who need small homes, rather than of grabbers, grafters, and monopolists? These are questions that deserve careful consideration.—*Duluth* (Minn.) *Herald*.

The public mind has been sufficiently informed on the subject of the necessity of reclaiming the arid lands, that Congress will not long hesitate to accord with the best interests of the country on the same.—*Tucson* (Ariz.) *Star*.

During the past year the drouth in India caused the great famine in that country; yet the English, by their great irrigation projects have vastly added to the producing capacity of the country and have greatly ameliorated the natural condition of the natives. Their irrigation works are the most extensive in the world, watering over 20,000,000 acres of very fertile soil. If the United States would do as much toward reclaiming the arid lands of the West as Great Britain has done in India, she would be conferring a greater blessing on our country than the acquiring of islands in the Pacific.—*Basot* (Neb.) *Eagle*.

With Nebraska's prairies covered with timber, and artificial lakes for irrigation purposes created, all its rich soil will be available for cultivation and the probable outcome, which at the present may seem like an idle dream, will be a reality.—*Norfolk* (Neb.) *Journal*.

There never was a time when so many people throughout the entire East so thoroughly understood the subject of water storage as they do now. The people east of the Mississippi appreciate the benefit to them of a more populous Western country, and they will cheerfully assist to make our millions of acres habitable by the people of our country. The time is ripe for such a movement, and the demand will continue to be made of our Government until the same is given the required attention. With the whole people aroused and battling for something, the benefit of which stands out so prominently, there can be but one result. Let the subject be kept before the people until the cause is won.—*Phoenix* (Ariz.) *Feeder and Farmer*.

The Eastern manufacturers and business men have at last awakened to the fact that the development of the arid West means the doubling of the business opportunities in all branches of trade. If the East will join with the West and demand in one voice the national system of storage reservoirs for the reclamation of the desert, the sage-brush plains of the West will soon be converted into waving fields of grain and pastures green.—*Bisbee* (Ariz.) *Review*.

With the East informed on this great question there will be but little difficulty in getting Congress to take the initiatory step in national legislation, resulting in untold benefits to the whole country.—*Berkeley* (Cal.) *Gazette*.

It is only rational that some plan be devised whereby the thing may be equalized and the water which does damage may be saved to do immeasurable good in seasons of prolonged drought. Whereas now we are losers under both conditions, by a judicious expenditure of Government funds in building reservoirs the industries and prosperity of the whole arid West could be put upon a basis of perfect stability. The West has been paying taxes for years to improve harbors and deepen rivers in the East; now let there be a reciprocation of the favor and some of the Eastern money used to build up the great West.—*Riverside* (Cal.) *Enterprise*.

We have been agreeably surprised at the attitude of our Eastern friends. Instead of opposition we have met with hearty cooperation, showing how fully awake they are to the future possibilities of the movement. With both political parties and the public in general in favor of it the chances for early action on the part of Congress are good.—*Azuza* (Cal.) *Pomotropic*.

It is gratifying to know that the next presiding officer of the United States Senate is in sympathy with the movement to reclaim the arid West and to reforest the mountains upon which the irrigators so much depend.—*Valencia* (Cal.) *Times*.

It is estimated that 50,000,000 people can be settled, under highly favorable conditions, on lands that are now practically barren. Congress, two or three years ago, appropriated \$100,000 for the necessary surveys. It is estimated that \$15,000,000 will build most of the dams proposed to start with. This is expansion of the right kind.—*San Francisco News-Letter*.

The National Irrigation Congress should have the support of the whole nation in its efforts to reclaim the arid lands of the great West.—*Los Gatos* (Cal.) *Mail*.

The national movement in favor of irrigation has become broad and popular, and Eastern manufacturers and business men generally seem to have at

last awakened to the fact that the reclaiming and populating of the arid regions of the West will largely increase the home market for their goods and thus add very materially to their own prosperity and that of the nation.—*Monterey (Cal.) Cypress*.

Governor Roosevelt's positive indorsement of the plan of national reclamation of arid lands and the outlining of a basis for work has greatly pleased and encouraged the people of the West. His candid presentation of the matter probably represents the most progressive thought of the East.—*Stockton (Cal.) Independent*.

This matter is worthy of the most serious consideration and affects the western portion of the country as nothing else could. We are all well aware that the present condition of noncultivation is due only to a lack of water. The soil is rich and in a condition to be easily improved. There are colonies of people in the East who would gladly take up the work of redemption if there was an abundance of water to assure the desired results for their labor. Let us help the enterprise by giving it our hearty support and in abetting the measures adopted by the National Irrigation Congress.—*Salida (Colo.) Mail*.

The development of the West must depend on irrigation. The problem is too great for a State or a corporation, and the first great work must be undertaken by the National Government; and surely the West is entitled to a portion of the aid that is given to the South for the reclamation of the sea and rivers. If the amount of money that has been spent on the Mississippi and on Southern tidewater cities had been spent on irrigation in the West, the center of population would have been a good many hundreds of miles nearer the Pacific coast than it is now.—*Leadville (Colo.) Democrat*.

The resolutions adopted by the National Irrigation Convention and some of the addresses delivered before that body are extremely interesting reading for the people of the arid West, and they afford proof that some of the best thought of the nation is now turned to the great problem of arid-land reclamation. And the men of the East are gaining an understanding of the question and have reached a realization of its importance to the whole country.—*Baker City (Oreg.) Democrat*.

The National Irrigation Congress will meet in Chicago November 21, 22, 23, and 24. The great interest shown in this great branch of industry by the country will have an effect on Congress, and insure the enactment of laws for storage reservoirs by the Government, and other expenditures in behalf of the people of the arid West.—*Sterling (Kans.) Democrat*.

The project, if carried out, will be a benefit to the nation. It will add an enormous area of very fertile land to the national domain, which will furnish homes to a vast population. An additional market will be created for our manufacturers, the railroads will be furnished with additional traffic, and the wide gap between the great central valley and the Pacific slope will be bridged over. Hence, there is a national aspect to the matter, which renders it entirely proper that Congress take action.—*Parsons (Kans.) Independent*.

The disadvantage of permitting the work of irrigation to be done by private corporations or syndicates is that the irrigation companies secure control of the water supply. For these reasons the National Government ought to take hold of the irrigation problem and work it out upon a more thorough and homogeneous plan. The National Administration and Congress are committed to the policy of nationalizing the work, and this action of the present meeting means practically the general expression which will sooner or later be embodied into law.—*Guthrie (Okla.) Capital*.

The question of irrigating the arid West has already been put off too long. It is a matter that has assumed now a prominence that is not confined to any one section. The manufacturers of the East see in the development of the arid West a broadening of their markets to an extent that could never be accomplished outside of our own borders. Transportation facilities are already there. The land is there, and it is ours. A third of the area of the United States is totally undeveloped. All that is needed is water, and it is water that must be provided by a national policy of reservoir construction.—*El Paso (Tex.) Herald*.

The present session of Congress is short, and there will come before it for consideration a large number of questions of great and far-reaching national importance. It will not be possible for Congress to say definitely whether this vast work shall be undertaken by the nation or not. But it does seem that even a few hours of consideration should satisfy members that there is enough in it to justify the nation in directing its skilled engineers to investigate the whole matter and report.—*El Paso (Tex.) Times*.

Irrigation advocates, by meeting in the cities of the East, can educate the business people to the wisdom of the proposed measure, appeal to the commercial interests from a business standpoint, and show how not only the West can be benefited, but how general business may be increased. Talks as to equity do not always go far; but when the practical irrigators assemble and show business men how there is money to be made by getting the Government to lend a hand in an enterprise, something can be done.—*El Paso (Tex.) News*.

The ninth annual irrigation congress is in session at Chicago. The West and Pacific States are largely represented. The purpose of these meetings is to urge the importance of the Government to reclaim the arid lands of the West through construction of mountain stream reservoirs.—*Sherman (Tex.) Democrat*.

The address delivered by Thomas L. Cannon, secretary of the St. Louis Manufacturing Association, should be read by every person interested in irrigation. Mr. Cannon showed a thorough mastery of the subject, and demonstrated what a splendid investment it would be for the Federal Government to expend \$500,000,000 for the reclamation of Western lands. He showed that the annual profit to the Eastern manufacturers and to the country at large would be double the interest on \$500,000,000, and that homes would be given to 50,000,000 people at a cost of \$33 each.—*Salt Lake Herald*.

The National Irrigation Congress held in Chicago was a great success. There was a large attendance from all parts of the country, and speakers from all parts declared with substantial unanimity for the development of the arid region along broad lines as a work of national character and importance. Attention was called to the fact that both the great political parties in their platforms in the last campaign declared in favor of the reclamation of "arid America."—*California Rural Press*.

The National Government ought to take hold of the irrigation problem and work it out upon a thorough and homogeneous plan. The work of the congress next week will be watched with close attention, especially as the newly elected National Administration and Congress are fully committed to the policy of nationalizing the work of irrigation.—*Facts, Colorado Springs, Colo.*

Commercial organizations throughout the West are discussing the feasibility of asking for an appropriation from the National Congress to be expended in reclaiming the immense bodies of arid lands lying in the several States and Territories.

It is claimed that the impounding of water of Western streams in reservoirs will serve two purposes splendidly. One of these is that the water will prevent alternating overflows and droughts, and another is that the water which has heretofore been wasted can be used to make the desert blossom as the rose. Undoubtedly the reclamation of arid lands in the West deserves attention at the present time.—*Houston (Tex.) Post*.

The congress will consider the whole irrigation question as affecting the

country west of the ninety-ninth meridian, and will continue to urge such measures of local and general legislation as will forward the purpose of the promoters of the congress.

The purpose is understood to be the storing of storm waters for distribution to the irrigable soil to make it fertile, open it for settlement, and furnish a field for occupancy by our citizens, who in agriculture can found independent homes, draw their support from the soil, and add to the country's surplus for export to the food consumers of the world.—*San Francisco Call*.

The National Irrigation Congress will meet at Chicago in ninth annual session the 21st of this month. While Chicago is not in a territory that depends upon irrigation directly, there is no part of the United States that is not concerned in the vital question of how the now barren acres of the plains and foothills can be made to produce, and areas denuded of trees once more be covered with a green and vigorous growth. Statesmen have long recognized the necessity for a system of water storage by which regions now arid would be made to fructify and fields take the place of wastes.—*Tacoma Ledger*.

Even those who admit the necessity of undertaking the proposed irrigation works say there is no occasion for hurry, that the food supply problem is years in the future. So it is, but such gigantic projects require years to mature, even when undertaken. More important than all of the reasons for urgency is the fact that present Government ownership of the lands involved affords the Government an opportunity to recoup itself for the outlay. It further assures the retention of the valuable water rights in the public instead of with private individuals or corporations which might in the future throw many obstacles in the way and make the people pay dearly for the delay. The welfare of large sections of the country is too vitally involved to allow these valuable rights to fall into private hands, which will be the inevitable result of unnecessary delay.—*Omaha Bee*.

The General Government must do it, because other agencies have failed. Private enterprise can't do it. The States can't do it. It is one of those colossal enterprises, like river and harbor improvement, that must be undertaken by Congress. The arid lands belong to the Government, and should be held by the Government for sale as partial reimbursement for the outlay. It is perilous for these immense tracts to be passed over wholly to the control of vast corporations, whose interests at any time might run seriously counter to those of thousands of settlers.—*Portland Oregonian*.

The Telegram has frequently expressed its sympathy with and approval of all legitimate efforts of the irrigationists, and it believes that some system could and should be devised by which the National Government would lend its encouragement, and even more substantial aid, to this object.—*Portland (Oreg.) Telegram*.

Missionary work in behalf of the irrigation project must be done in and out of Congress as well. It must be shown to Eastern communities that they are interested in the increased population and production of the great West. Best of all, the Western delegations should stand and work together for this project and gain as many new friends for it as possible by any legitimate means.—*Helena (Mont.) Record*.

The cause is of especial importance to the West, and Utah is vitally interested, with its vast areas of barren land that only needs irrigation to convert them into "fruitful fields."—*Provo City (Utah) Enquirer*.

Of course such a gigantic enterprise would be absolutely futile without Government aid, and as such lands are a part of the Government domain—in fact, the greater part—to it must fall the task of reclamation, which means the expenditure of a large sum of money.

While it is not proposed to reclaim all such lands at once, the time is ripe for the initiatory step in that direction. There is hardly any doubt but the Government would get its money back, dollar for dollar, as fast as such lands were made desirable and habitable. A pleasing feature connected with this gigantic enterprise is the favor with which the scheme is looked upon by many prominent men of the East. They realize that, while it will prove of great value to the West, it will in turn benefit the East. There is no getting away from this proposition.—*Lewistown (Mont.) Argus*.

Irrigation is the only means possible by which millions of acres of the finest land on earth can ever be watered in the West, and there is every reason to hope that Congress will immediately come to a realization of the importance of voting an appropriation for the starting of the work, and the way to hurry the proposition along is for those most deeply interested in the matter to send capable men to the congress which will meet to talk over and crystallize into law the most feasible plan for the accomplishment of a purpose which means so much for this Western country.—*Billings (Mont.) Times*.

The Western delegates strongly favor a movement looking to the reclamation by the Government of the arid lands of the West through the construction of mountain stream reservoirs. Irrigation is no longer considered as merely an appendage to agriculture or the cultivation of the soil. It is a social and economic factor in a much larger way. It not only makes a civilization in the midst of desolate wastes, but it shapes and colors that civilization after its own peculiar design. The people of Utah, having been pioneers in irrigation, know what it has done here for them; others, now see, too, and are taking notes. It forbids land monopoly, because only the small farm pays when the land must be artificially watered. In the same manner it makes near neighbors and high social conditions. It discourages servile labor by developing a class of small landed proprietors who work for themselves and need but little help beyond that which their own families supply.—*Logan City (Utah) Journal*.

Irrigation has become a live question which will have to be disposed of in the near future, to furnish homes for the peoples who do not care to become denizens of a city or of a town. The elements of commerce are largely included in irrigation, and the commercial side of the work should receive notice, which would place it among the questions before the country to entitle it to a hearing before Congress upon its merits.—*Reno (Nev.) Journal*.

A hundred million acres of good land are unfit for cultivation and, in fact, for habitation, because the rainfall is not sufficient to insure good crops. The national interest in reclaiming this big stretch of arid land shows that work along the right line is progressing rapidly. The expense of putting this land into a profitable agricultural condition of course is very great, but if Uncle Sam gets back of it and the right men engineer it, there will be but little difficulty in creating a desirable territory for new homes for industrious farmers.—*Carson City (Nev.) Appeal*.

The telegram sent by the National Irrigation Congress at Chicago, urging upon President McKinley the importance of the irrigation and forestry problem and requesting him to in turn urge upon Congress the advisability of definite action, has done more to direct public attention to these important national questions than any other one thing. The telegram was as follows:

"TO THE PRESIDENT:

"The ninth annual session of the National Irrigation Congress, now in session in the city of Chicago, respectfully urges that in your message to Congress you call attention to the national importance of the preservation of our forests and of the extension and conservative use of the forest preserves, and further that you emphasize the need of national action to store the flood waters that now go to waste."—*Gardnerville (Nev.) Courier*.

The holding of the National Irrigation Congress in the East, as it turned out, was a wise move. The people of that half of the country have had the subject of national irrigation brought home to them in a manner not otherwise possible. The far-reaching importance of the problem has been presented to them and a genuine interest has been awakened. Instead of finding opposition in the East, the congress found that Eastern men of prominence were more than interested in a proposition which promised an increased Western population of millions of people.—*Chinook (Mont.) Opinion*.

As the "enemy's country" has been invaded, the myth of Eastern opposition has faded away and its people are found to be anxious to see inaugurated a national policy of Western arid-land reclamation. The Western delegates went home with the feeling that they have the hearty support of Eastern interests in securing action which will open to settlement half a continent.—*Mariposa (Cal.) Gazette*.

There are said to be 75,000,000 acres of arable land owned by the General Government now practically useless, but capable of reclamation by irrigation. This is a tract of land equal to one-fifth of all the land in this country now under cultivation, and its reclamation would add almost an empire to the available assets of the nation. The work is one which private enterprise can not well undertake. It requires not only a large capital, but absolute control over the head waters of some of the principal streams of the country and of the region surrounding their sources. Individuals do not possess this and there are objections to granting it to them. The Government, however, has control and can maintain it.—*Grand Rapids Press*.

As the proprietor of this land the Government would be pursuing a policy of self-interest by increasing the value of its lands. In the nature of things the maintenance of irrigation works are public functions, like the building of light-houses or public highways, and should not be relegated to the several States or to individuals or corporations, for the reason that an equitable distribution of impounded waters could not be insured except through the interposition of an authority whose jurisdiction should not be limited by State lines.

When improvements are made in the interests of the country at large no one disputes the employment of moneys derived from national revenues. The reclaiming of this land is on a par with river and harbor improvements, and should not be made a political issue. A better investment was never made by a government since the world began.—*York (Pa.) Press*.

Thus an immense yearly destruction of property along the rivers in the spring months would be spared, and at the same time navigation would be improved and the lands be rendered more productive. According to the estimates of Government engineers who have made a study of the subject, \$150,000,000 would do this work, and the expenditure would be distributed over ten or twelve years. Manifestly, an improvement of such dimensions ought to receive the consideration of the entire country. The whole country ought to join in the movement to "annex the arid West."—*Leslie's Weekly*.

Public funds must be wisely used in the construction of works of reclamation, and this will surely come about when the people of the country are fully conversant with the facts. These facts are being obtained by the investigations of the United States Geological Survey in the water resources of the country and the extent to which the arid lands can be redeemed by irrigation. The Survey is doing excellent work.—*Missoula (Mont.) Fruit Grower*.

While the East is willing to assist and co-operate, it expects, of course, that the West will make its own fight. Every local Western organization of whatever character—chambers of commerce, boards of trade, commercial clubs, business associations—everything with a president and a secretary, should discuss and take action upon this question of national irrigation and Government appropriations for the building of storage reservoirs, and then stand ready to cooperate with the National Irrigation Association for whatever procedure is necessary.—*Richfield (Utah) Reaper*.

Some hundred prominent daily Eastern newspapers recently have editorially expressed views favorable to a system of national irrigation. It would seem that the East is well in line in wishing the development and reclamation of the great area west of the hundredth meridian, and that it is realized that such a development would benefit the entire country and be a national benefit, adding to the general wealth and power of the nation.—*Buffalo (Wyo.) Voice*.

Several conventions have lately been held in the far West in the interest of irrigation, by means of which it is proposed to bring into cultivation the semiarid States west of the Mississippi, and nearly every trans-Mississippi convention has adopted resolutions on this subject. All of these resolutions declare in favor of the Government taking charge of irrigation and providing the money for the canals that are needed. Federal aid is urged on the ground that the improvement can not be made without the assistance of the General Government, and that the country will remain in an undeveloped condition forever, whereas its improvement will add to the wealth of the whole country.—*New Orleans Times-Democrat*.

All the world is interested in the plan to have the Government build a system of storage reservoirs near the head waters of streams to use for irrigating purposes. The idea is that private capital might be depended on to distribute the water to the users. As the Government controls rivers it could appropriately undertake the diversion of superfluous water in the winter and early spring into reservoirs, where it could be stored until it should be needed in the summer.—*Cambridge (Idaho) Citizen*.

The sentiment in favor of national storage reservoirs is growing daily. Talk the matter up with your neighbors and petition your Senators and Representatives to work for the establishment of a national storage reservoir system.—*Dolores (Colo.) Silver Star*.

Congress should appropriate money for storage reservoirs. The building of storage reservoirs would obviate the necessity for much river expenditure and would help immigration, as the home-building area of the United States would be vastly increased.—*Santa Clara (Cal.) News*.

Why should Congress have the power to protect or improve one portion of its property if not another? And how much more benefit is now received by the dredging and widening of creeks and bayous than would be realized by the enhanced value of these arid lands and by their increased production.—*Healdsburg (Cal.) Tribune*.

The new homes which the reclaimed lands might afford would be open to the farmers of Ohio and every part of the Union, and all parts of the nation would enjoy the enlarged area of productive soil, therefore it is not a measure confined to Western interests, but extends its benefits to any and all who desire to build homes and add to the productivity of their country.—*Ogden (Utah) Standard*.

Already nearly every commercial and business organization in the United States is upon record as being in favor of national legislation upon the question, but there is still a chance for working up a still greater sentiment among the masses of the people in the East as well as in the West.—*Las Vegas (N. Mex.) Optic*.

Through a gradual evolution national irrigation has finally crystallized into a movement which is essentially national in its broadest sense, and the organizations that are now enlisting in the cause are not promoting it from any local or sectional point of view, but from the conviction that the planting of American civilization and the building of homes for 100,000,000 new citizens under the American flag in places which are now waste and desolate

is a national purpose, which demands support from citizen and statesman, from merchant and manufacturer, from farmer and factory operative, and from every class of the people and section of the country.—*Newman (Cal.) Index*.

Agricultural, commercial, horticultural, and labor organizations from one end of the country to the other have strongly indorsed the national irrigation movement by resolutions, and given to it their earnest aid and cooperation, because the far-reaching and widespread benefits from the reclamation of this vast area of virgin territory would create a national prosperity in which all would share.—*St. Johns (Ariz.) Herald*.

Public sentiment is beginning to recognize the necessity as well as the importance of the irrigation movement. Short-sighted opposition will not amount to anything. The fear of overproduction is not well founded, for the irrigation of these areas and the increased population will cause greater demand for the products. Our markets are constantly increasing, and the demands upon the coast and mountain States are larger than the supply. The increasing imports to the Orient and the Philippines and the necessity for supplying the increasing population of Alaska have outstripped the production of these States in certain lines.—*Montana Sunday Record*.

When an Eastern paper with the influence of the Saturday Evening Post, of Philadelphia devotes editorial space to the need of Government assistance in irrigation for the arid area of Western America, it may be concluded that the campaign is having force.—*Santa Barbara (Cal.) Press*.

Eminent Army engineers have testified that a thorough system of storage reservoirs in the arid region would diminish the size and destructive force of the annual floods in the Mississippi. The subject is one of practical interest in the West, and was regarded of sufficient political importance to be given the indorsement of both of the great national conventions last year.—*Baltimore Sun*.

National storage reservoirs for the waste waters of the great arid region of the West is the theme which is interesting vast numbers of our people. The practical ability for undertaking this much-needed work lies with the General Government. No organization of private enterprise and capital is adequate to the vast work required. There is an immense field for utilitarian effort, which must be taken up and acted upon by the General Government. According to the last annual report of the Secretary of the Interior, there are 17,000,000 acres of public arid land in California which is capable of irrigation under a governmental system of storage reservoirs. If we allow 40 acres for a home, this would give 425,000 families added to those we now have, and, allowing five persons to the family, we would have an increase of 2,125,000 people for this State alone.—*San Pedro (Cal.) Times*.

Prominent daily Eastern newspapers recently have editorially expressed views favorable to a system of national irrigation. While the East is thus willing to assist and cooperate, it expects, of course, that the West will make its own fight.—*Hemet (Cal.) News*.

Irrigation will be the watchword of the farmer of the twentieth century. Irrigation will make the West as rich an empire as the whole nation is to-day. In this section where water is rare, where all flood waters should be stored, Government help is needed to do what it would take private enterprise several centuries to accomplish. It is utterly to hasten events and to prevent the land and water from falling into the hands of grasping monopolies. The beginning that has been made by private enterprise shows what can be done, and has also sufficiently illustrated that private capital can not make such enterprises profitable to itself, although profitable to others, unless it charges exorbitant prices for land and water.—*Santa Fe New Mexican*.

The Government has spent over \$11,000,000 in improving the navigation of the Missouri River, and, as its middle course is through an arid or semiarid region, and as the necessity for water transportation increases in direct ratio to the productiveness of the land through which the river flows, it seems logical and right that the attention of the Federal authority should now be given to the conservation, for irrigation purposes, of its surplus flood, which does such great damage along its lower course when, swelled by melting snows, its mighty volume bursts through its expensive confines.—*Sutherland (Nebr.) Free Lance*.

More interest is being taken these days in the cause of irrigation than ever before. When the great West of the United States takes hold of this question with a will it will be recognized by the General Government, and instead of all the West getting a nominal nothing in the way of appropriations it will receive its just dues, and reservoirs will be built by the Government.—*Reddy (Cal.) Exponent*.

There is no question of the growth of sentiment in favor of action by the Federal Government to provide storage reservoirs for waste waters in the arid regions of the Western States. Indeed, the National Government is the only agency capable of handling the enterprise in a way to protect the storage and to carry on the undertaking on a scale of sufficient magnitude to make it successful.—*Red Bluff People's Cause*.

If the water from the melting snows of the mountain region were safely impounded in the gulches and canyons of the foothills to be directed by human intelligence, the arid lands of our country would be irrigated and made to blossom like the rose.—*San Diego (Cal.) Vidette*.

What is immediately needed is the inauguration of a comprehensive national policy of irrigation, which will select the sites of storage basins in the Rocky Mountains and their foothills, and begin their construction.—*National Tribune*.

While manufacturers and capitalists are looking abroad for territory in which to establish markets, there are to-day within our own borders great tracts of arid lands, which, if irrigated by the stored waters which now run to waste, would accommodate a vast population of home builders, affording a ready and generous market virtually at the doors of our manufacturers.—*Port Orchard Independent*.

One-third of the United States is yet vacant public land, rich in possibilities. Here lies a broad field for statesmanship in directing the utilization of untouched opportunities, and our success in handling these problems in our midst may naturally measure our ability to handle our external affairs.—*Escondido (Cal.) Times*.

If some means could be devised, and the thing is altogether practicable, to supply water to the arid lands of the West, they could be made to sustain a population that would add greatly to the wealth of the country.—*Richmond (Va.) Times*.

The further development of the West, by irrigation or otherwise, would further develop the East, would stimulate its manufacturing industries, and these are dependent for support upon the Eastern farm products.—*American Farmer*.

It would be the greatest blessing of national domestic legislation to irrigate them (the arid lands) under national supervision. It would make the West the mightiest granary of the world.—*Portland (Oreg.) Chronicle*.

It would be a wise and economical policy for the Government to undertake the reclamation of some of the vast regions of arid but fertile lands in the United States. What more beneficent work can the Government do than to reclaim these lands, such as are capable of profitable cultivation.—*Pomona (Cal.) Progress*.

SECRETARY HITCHCOCK ON IRRIGATION.

Secretary Hitchcock of the Interior Department has performed a valuable service for the cause of irrigation. Being from St. Louis and interested in

the development of the trans-Mississippi West, he has paid more than ordinary attention to the subject, and, better than some alleged statesmen on the floors of Congress, he realizes the benefits that will accrue to the whole nation by the adoption of a policy that will reclaim the lands of the arid region.

At the request of the House Committee on Public Lands, Secretary Hitchcock has prepared a statement of his views on this question, and his paper was submitted to the committee. It is a broad and comprehensive document. One-third of the whole area of the United States, he says, exclusive of Alaska and the new insular possessions, consists of public lands open to settlement under the homestead act. This one-third, he continues, "includes some of the richest agricultural lands in the world, capable of producing enormous crops," and the only obstacle which prevents its utilization is a scarcity of water at certain times and seasons.

Noting the necessity of the conserving of the water and the floods in this region, and of their artificial distribution, he asserts that "when this is done there will be opportunities for thousands, or even millions, of homes within the portion of the United States now almost uninhabitable. The creation of these homes would add enormously to the material wealth of the nation, and the utilization of this vast area of farming land will in no way reduce the value of the lands now cultivated." He denies that these crops will come in competition with those of the East, but asserts that they will find and reach other markets. "More than this," he adds, "the possible population west of the Mississippi will vastly enhance the volume of trade and manufacture throughout the rest of the country, and will make more valuable the productive area to the great manufacturing centers in the East."

The Secretary estimates that at least 74,000,000 acres of land can be reclaimed by a wise policy on the part of the General Government, and that homes can be made for 50,000,000 of people. The remarkable results accomplished in the valley of the Nile, he continues, "in practically redeeming Egypt from a state of bankruptcy, should encourage a most liberal consideration of the question of irrigation. It is desirable that such reasonable expenditures be made by the Federal Government, as well as by the States, as will gradually, but as rapidly as possible, insure the blessings consequent upon a well defined and executed system of irrigation."

The Secretary then reviews at some length the work of the irrigation survey and the achievements of private enterprise, and expresses the opinion that the limit of individual effort has about been reached, and that future reclamations of the arid lands must be the work of the Government. "The importance of providing under wise administration," he concludes, "homes for many millions of citizens is so urgent that some steps should be taken toward completing our knowledge of the extent to which the arid lands may be redeemed."—*Denver News*.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to have Senators read those views and see to what extent the country is being educated. Fault is found because an association of people are in favor of this great enterprise, and we have objections about irrigation associations. There are a great many associations. There are mercantile associations, and there are associations in favor of the improvement of rivers and harbors. I remember when I was a boy there were meetings held in favor of internal improvements, and they were addressed by orators from all parts of the country.

It was an issue whether there should be any internal improvements at all or not. That policy has been established, and see what it has done for commerce. There was the organization of associations everywhere to promote internal improvements which we now have as a settled policy, and it should be no crime now to advocate the improvement of this vast section, two-fifths of the whole area, which is known to be fertile. That should be agitated. It should be discussed in the newspapers, as the question of internal improvements was thirty, forty, or fifty years ago. It is not a matter of reproach. It is legitimate American enterprise; it is legitimate American thought, and it ought to be heeded.

I have not introduced bills to make special appropriations for dams, reservoirs, etc., because the country was not prepared for it. It takes time for the country to wake up to it. The first bills that were introduced to improve rivers and harbors were beaten in Congress. But the necessity for it grew as commerce grew, and the necessity for utilizing this vast heritage of two-fifths of the whole area of the United States for the coming population will grow stronger and stronger. Whatever may be said, something will be done, and it will be honorably done. There is no indirection about this proposition. This proposition comes straight to investigate a matter where it is necessary for the Indians, and in that investigation and in those surveys there may be an incidental benefit to the whites if it is carried out.

I am certain that it will be carried out. It will nearly double the population of Arizona. It will be a great object lesson. If the Government is not disposed to carry it out somebody will. If the lands can be used and protected and the opportunity is given, why should we be accused of indirection and trickery and all that because we are in favor of giving proper attention to a great subject? The greatest subject now agitating the minds of the people, so far as this country is concerned, is whether we can irrigate that vast region and populate it as thickly as Indiana and Illinois. Although we will always have waste lands there, there are valleys you can populate much more thickly than those States. More people can live on the same area of irrigated land than can live where you depend on a rainfall. You can have the thickest kind of population where you have irrigation.

The people all over the country, not in the arid region alone, are looking to this as a heritage of America where American enterprise is to go, and from which great results are to come. To accuse men of bad faith, and all that because they are in favor of what is for the manifest interests of the country is something which I reject and repel. There has been nothing done in connection

with this question which should reflect upon anybody as honorable men. This proposition was commenced two years ago. It has progressed thus far. The question is, Shall the investigation be completed and the proposition be put in a position where Congress can do it, or should somebody else do it?

I do not care how much talk there is about the flow and about getting the water there, you have now got to support the Indians at the rate of \$30,000 a year, and if the Government went on with this enterprise it would give them all employment. They will work. They are good Indians and they have been accustomed to work. There will be no trouble about that. They go off to find work. I know them well. They are Indians who have always had "a local habitation and a name" where they live; and if you give these Indians an opportunity to work they will do so, and if you give them back the water for their farms they will cultivate them and make a living for themselves. If you feed them you make paupers of them. You have no right to do that. They were never beggars. They always took care of themselves, and we must give them that same chance again. It would be a great wrong to make beggars of them. Let them work and earn their own living from their little farms. That is what they want.

If Congress will not authorize the Government to do it, let us give the contract to other parties to build this ditch, and make it a condition that these Indians shall be employed. But that question is to be determined when the result of this investigation comes in. I do not think that the investigation should be stopped for the bare fear that it might illustrate the possibilities of developing that country and benefiting mankind, and showing what vast resources we have. Because the possibilities are good that may come from the investigation I do not think it should be stopped.

Nothing is asked from the Government of the United States except money for the investigation, and the question as to whether the Government shall undertake the work of building the dam is entirely open and remains so. I would not ask the Government to build the dam without having it perfectly understood why it was done. The reason should be always given. Everything should be frank, as it is in this proposition. I say now that I shall never argue that the Government is committed to this proposition because this is done, but if it illustrates a great idea, shows the road to wealth, to prosperity, to progress, to the place to make homes for people, nobody will be sorry; and the Senator from Connecticut will be delighted, because he is a good man at heart. He is full of prejudice, but he is not as bad a man as he tried to make us believe he was. He does not hate the West.

I believe all these people who are opposing it are pretty good, but they have been living in a certain locality and they get in ruts. They have not seen that country. Let them go there. I should like to hear what they would say then. A handful of Mormons went into the desert, and it looked as if living there was impossible. The history of the opening of the country at Salt Lake is the most interesting part of the history of the United States. They learned to irrigate the land and they have made it a rich State, a garden spot, and they have set an example which has done good everywhere. When, without money, poor as they were, foot-sore and hungry as they traveled over the plains, they could stop there and build up such a country as that, it shows what can be accomplished. When you see them in their homes now it makes you glad that the pioneers, if they were Mormons, did such great work.

It was because they were Mormons that they had a faith which held them together, and they accomplished great results and built a great State. Now, when such results are shown to a person who goes there a good deal of his prejudice must melt away, and a good deal of your prejudice will melt away when you see what irrigation accomplishes. Go to Colorado and see what irrigation has accomplished there. You can see what they have accomplished in various Western States. You see beautiful fields, rich fruits, and everything produced by irrigation. Follow it up and see how much land remains unirrigated, and you see what vast opportunities are spread out to American enterprise. When you see all that, you will commence studying how we can devise some legislation that will facilitate this great work.

It is proposed now that we shall take some money out of the Treasury and irrigate the lands for the Indians, and this investigation is to determine how much money may be needed and whether it will all come back to the Treasury from the Government land which will be irrigated with the surplus water in excess of what the Indians need. There are over 5,000 Indians who have got to be provided for. Either they must be fed or they must have the means of irrigation. The amendment provides for completing this investigation. The last investigation, which was carried as far as the money went, gives maps of the dams and everything that could be done with that money, but now it is found necessary before it can be accomplished to have more money to complete the investigation and test the foundation for the dam, and I believe we should have more money. I do not believe Congress will quit this investigation until the investigation is completed.

General Deficiency Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. LOVERING,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 20, 1901.

On the bill (H. R. 14236) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. LOVERING said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Availing myself of the privilege to print authorized by the House in the discussion of the pending bill, I desire to submit for the information of the House and the country an argument recently prepared by the executive committee of the Indianapolis monetary convention upon our paper currency and the need for making it responsive to the varying needs of business at all seasons and in all sections:

SYNOPSIS OF THE ARGUMENT FOR CARRYING OUT THE PLEDGE OF THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL PLATFORM.

The time is close at hand when some measures must be taken to provide a more elastic and sufficient paper currency for the United States in order to make the currency system more responsive to the varying needs of business.

All means of increasing the currency, except by gold, had practically been removed prior to the refunding law of 1900, and further increase under this law has been cut off by the termination of refunding.

The present profit upon circulation secured by United States bonds is too small to encourage any further increase of bank-note circulation.

The growth of the business of the country has absorbed the new bank-note currency and the increase in the gold stock as fast as they have become available, and the demand is still unsatisfied.

The supply of currency has a close connection with the rate of interest for money. If the currency supply is insufficient, discount and interest rates are high.

Low interest rates are vital to the prosperity of a producing, manufacturing, and exporting country, and to fair wages and steady employment for labor.

Low interest rates mean favorable conditions of competition with other countries having ample capital and a sufficient currency. High interest rates mean unfavorable conditions of competition with such countries.

The rental paid for money by the manufacturer and exporter influences his rate of profit and his ability to lay down goods in foreign markets upon terms as favorable as his foreign competitors.

The ability to sell abroad means the ability of the manufacturer to dispose of surplus product and to keep his mills in steady operation.

The steady operation of manufacturing plants means a constant demand for labor and liberal compensation to the wage-earner.

A sufficient supply of currency provides facilities for moving the crops, and means the ability of the factor and merchant to pay higher prices for farm products.

Payments to the farmer for his products in currency, instead of payments by bank credits, provide a convenient medium of exchange, enable the farmer to pay currency to his hands, and keep a sufficient supply of currency in circulation for the convenience of farming communities.

The Republican national platform and the annual message of President McKinley to the second session of the Fifty-sixth Congress both favor "such legislation as will better make the currency responsive to the varying needs of business at all seasons and in all sections."

The Republican party is therefore committed to proper currency legislation, and should take early action before stringency is felt in the money market.

If a new currency system is to be tried, a beginning should be made before a great increase in circulation is necessary, in order that the new method may be tested by the light of experience.

A sound system of paper currency is one which keeps the circulation adjusted to the demands of business. Such a system could be secured by authorizing national banks to issue an amount of circulating notes limited to a small proportion of their paid-up capital. The absolute safety of such notes could be insured by imposing a small tax upon the circulation, the proceeds of which should constitute a guarantee fund for the redemption of the notes of failed banks.

Statistics and experience prove that a tax of one-half of 1 per cent would afford a fund six or seven times more than sufficient to pay all losses which were not recovered from the assets of the issuing bank.

It is highly desirable that such a system should be put in force and tested under the auspices of the Republican party, while they are in control of all branches of the Government, in order that the monetary system may be in such working order that it can not be again successfully assailed for lack of soundness, flexibility, or responsiveness to the growing business needs of the American people.

OUR PAPER CURRENCY—THE NEED FOR MAKING IT RESPONSIVE TO THE VARYING NEEDS OF BUSINESS AT ALL SEASONS AND IN ALL SECTIONS.

The demands for currency are such in the United States, owing to the rapidly growing population and expanding volume of trade, that the question of providing some means for giving greater flexibility to the present currency system, and permitting an increase in small notes when they are needed, must soon demand the serious attention of Congress.

The scarcity of currency.—It was obvious to financial students, before the passage of the gold-standard act of March 14, 1900, that a serious scarcity of paper money would soon be felt in the United States, unless some provision were made for an increase in the supply.

The repeal of the silver-purchase law in 1893 practically arrested all means of increasing the currency of the United States, except by the production and importation of gold. The law permitted an increase in national-bank notes, but there was so little inducement to increase the amount that the national-bank note circulation, under a serious pressure for money, increased only from \$200,311,993 on November 1, 1893, one of the lowest points after the panic, to \$243,790,348 on December 1, 1899. There was practically no increase during the whole of the year 1899, and the average increase for six years was but little more than \$7,000,000 per year. Even this small increase would not have occurred if the Government had not issued in 1894, 1895, and 1896, some

\$382,000,000 in new bonds. For all practical purposes the capacity for increase in bank-note circulation came to a halt at the beginning of 1899, because the profit upon circulation was trifling after allowance was made for the deduction of taxes, redemption fund, and the difference between the price of the bonds and the notes received for them by the banks.

Relief afforded by the refunding law.—A means of increase in the bank-note currency was afforded by the refunding provision of the act of March 14, 1900, which reduced the tax upon bank-note circulation secured by the new 2-per cent bonds, and authorized the issue of circulation to the par value of the bonds deposited as security. This difference in the profit upon the circulation stimulated the issue of bank notes until the total amount outstanding on December 31, 1900, was \$330,695,834. This somewhat accidental resource, therefore, afforded the country an increase in currency of about \$36,000,000 last year, and prevented the acute stringency which would have been felt without it. But this resource has been practically exhausted. The issue of the new 2-per cent bonds in exchange for other classes has been suspended, and only about \$65,000,000 are owned outside national banks. More than this, the bonds available as the basis of banking circulation promise to be greatly reduced within a few years by the debt-paying policy of the Government. If \$50,000,000 in bonds are retired annually for several years, to meet the requirements of the sinking fund, the country will face the remarkable situation in regard to its supply of paper currency, that the means of increase are being constantly narrowed while the demand for increase is constantly growing. The following table shows the net rate of profit, over and above the profit upon a direct loan of capital, upon circulation based upon different classes of United States bonds:

Net banking profit on bond-secured notes (with money at 6 per cent).
[Quotations of October 31, 1900.]

Class of bonds.	Market value.	Net banking profit.
Twos of 1930.....	\$104.648	Per cent. 1.651
Threes of 1918.....	109.883	0.304
Fours of 1907.....	115.296	0.119
Fours of 1925.....	134.753	0.155
Fives of 1904.....	113.253	* 0.515

* Loss.

Absorption of cash in bank reserves.—The need for an increase in the paper currency of the country is keenly felt during periods of business prosperity for several reasons. The increased volume of business calls for a larger volume of the medium of exchange for carrying it on. More money is carried in the pockets of the people, and more money is required to purchase a given list of articles if the prices of those articles are higher than during the period of depression. Additional sums still are required if the number of purchasers rises through increased employment. More than this, the increased loans of the banks make it necessary for them to increase their reserves in money. Banks therefore are compelled to withdraw money from active circulation in periods of active business in a larger proportion than during periods of depression, while the demand for it in circulation has greatly increased. The following table shows how rapidly money has been absorbed into national-bank reserves, in spite of the large amount outstanding during the last few years:

June 30—	Money in circulation.	Money in national banks.	Net money outside banks.
1879.....	\$318,631,793	\$134,532,439	\$684,079,354
1884.....	1,243,925,696	196,448,894	1,047,476,805
1889.....	1,380,361,649	288,250,701	1,092,110,948
1891.....	1,497,490,707	310,014,348	1,187,476,359
1892.....	1,601,347,187	366,350,496	1,234,996,691
1893.....	1,596,701,245	289,254,850	1,307,446,395
1894.....	1,660,808,708	438,931,970	1,221,876,738
1895.....	1,601,968,473	382,942,306	1,219,026,167
1896.....	1,506,343,066	344,213,739	1,162,129,327
1897.....	1,640,330,519	413,518,621	1,226,811,898
1898.....	1,837,859,805	470,977,127	1,366,882,678
1899.....	1,932,484,239	492,857,679	1,439,626,560
1900.....	2,062,425,496	504,194,632	1,558,230,864

An examination of these figures shows that from June 30, 1893, to June 30, 1900, a period of seven years, the money in the hands of the people, outside national banks, increased only \$225,000,000, or at the rate of about \$32,500,000 per year. A large part of this increase came from the inducement to increase bank circulation offered by the refunding law. The increase for the six years ending June 30, 1899, was only \$132,000,000, or at the rate of \$22,000,000 per year. Population increased at the rate of about 8,500,000 during this interval. The new population had a money allowance per capita of only \$15.50, or \$4 below the average need indicated by the per capita supply of money in 1893. The supply of money outside national banks in 1893 was about \$19.50 per capita.

The amount on July 1, 1900, had risen in spite of the increase under the refunding law only to \$20.50 per capita, while the estimated amount per capita, including that in the banks, had increased by \$2.91. The difference was absorbed in bank reserves. The wonderful expansion in business activity had been met by an average increase of only a dollar in the pocket of the citizen, or about \$5 for each family of five. While this increase has perhaps been adequate for meeting present conditions, it is obvious that if it is arbitrarily arrested much inconvenience to the individual and embarrassment to business may ensue. It becomes the duty of Congress, therefore, to face seriously the problem of providing a more elastic resource for paper currency.

The currency system affects competitive production.—A sufficient supply of currency is vital to the effective competition of the United States with other producing nations in foreign markets. This is so because of the influence of the supply of currency upon the rate for the rental of money and the stimulus to production and exchange which are afforded by a proper circulating medium. A proper supply of currency is as necessary to a community doing business under modern conditions as steam power for turning the mill wheels or freight cars for carrying the products of the mill to market. The rental value of the currency is determined by its supply. An ample supply of capital which can be converted readily into currency will result in low rates for the rental of money. A scarcity of capital or obstacles put in the way of converting it into a useful form will result in high rates for the rental of money.

The difference between low and high rates for money may make the difference between the ability of two competing manufacturers in different countries to meet each other upon equal terms in a foreign market. If the

American manufacturer can produce goods with exactly the same economy in respect to cost of raw materials, operating expenses, and wages as his foreign competitor, but has to pay 1 or 2 per cent more for money, he will be driven to the wall by his foreign competitor. The margin of profit is usually too small to permit him to reduce his profits by his loss through interest payments, and if the margin of profit is wide, his competitor will soon reduce it to the point where he will be driven from the field. The manufacturer, moreover, in studying the several elements in the cost of competitive production, among which are high interest rates, cost of raw material, operating expenses, and wages, may be compelled to reduce wages in order to offset high rates for money. Thus the question of interest rates will be brought directly home to the wage-earner. It will be brought home still more forcibly if the American manufacturer is unable, by reason of high charges for money, to maintain his footing in foreign markets and his surplus is thrown back upon the American market. Overproduction which finds no outlet in foreign markets will then result in the loss of profits, the stoppage of mills, a narrower field for the employment of labor, and the throwing of laboring men out of employment.

The bank note is the poor man's money.—A sufficient supply of paper currency tends to diffuse it in rural communities instead of leaving it concentrated in the great cities. This diffusion of the supply of currency is perhaps of more direct advantage to the wage-earner and small trader than to the manufacturer and capitalist, who are able to conduct many of their operations by means of other forms of credit. Their individual credit is of such a character that their checks and promissory notes serve the purpose of a medium of exchange in their larger transactions. To this extent these instruments take the place of credit in the form of notes, because their credit is well known and commands sufficient confidence among those to whom it is offered. The bank note, on the other hand, as the eminent French economist, Léon Say, declared in a debate in the French Senate in 1884, "is the deposit account of humble citizens and small merchants." The rich obviate the use of money by taking a check book. The humbler citizen deals in a form of deposit account on the bank by taking its bills. A proper supply of currency issued through local banks would do away, in many cases, with the system of store credits and discounts upon wage checks, which often cause loss, under present conditions, to the farmer and the laborer.

The interest of the borrower.—The fundamental benefit of a sound, sufficient, and flexible bank-note currency is its benefit to the borrower. It is the interest of the borrower of money rather than the lender of money which should be considered in legislation designed to further the commercial greatness of the United States. Liberal banking facilities, with few restrictions upon the use of credit, and the extension of banking branches to all quarters of the world, are what enable the great British, French, German, and Belgian banks to extend long credits in foreign commerce. The people extending such accommodation, through the ability of their bankers to grant long credits and of their merchants to borrow the money necessary for their transactions at low rates, are bound to control the new trade of the undeveloped countries. This will be one of the vital elements in the opening of markets in China, Siberia, and other undeveloped countries. It has given a large part of the South American trade to British and German merchants when it ought to belong to those of the United States.

The interest of the borrower, therefore, is the interest of the country of whose industrial equipment he is a part, and his interest is at once that of the laborer for wages and of the banker. Ample facilities for transferring capital mean low interest rates and long credits, but they do not mean a loss to the banker, because he will share in the increased volume of business, the continuous activity, and the absence from disturbing panics which will follow the ability of our merchants to find an outlet for their surplus in foreign markets.

The pledge of the national platform.—These necessities of the monetary situation were foreseen by the Republican national convention at Philadelphia when it declared in the platform adopted in June, 1900:

"We recognize that interest rates are a potent factor in production and business activity, and for the purpose of further equalizing and of further lowering the rates of interest we favor such monetary legislation as will enable the varying needs of the seasons and of all sections to be promptly met, in order that trade may be evenly sustained, labor steadily employed, and commerce enlarged."

President McKinley put the seal of his approval upon this declaration in his last annual message to Congress, December 3, 1900, when he declared:

"The party in power is committed to such legislation as will better make the currency responsive to the varying needs of business at all seasons and in all sections."

A proposal for carrying out the pledge.—It remains to be considered how these desirable results shall be brought about. It may be advisable that the first steps taken should be of a moderate character, in order that any defects in the new legislation may be cured, and that any question as to its safety and efficiency in the minds of the people may be settled before it is adopted on a large scale. For this reason a plan has been proposed which provides for gradually meeting the need for new currency by authorizing national banks to issue notes to be known as guaranteed bank notes, without depositing United States bonds as security. The new circulation can not be issued at first, however, beyond the amount of one-fifth of the circulation secured by bonds, nor beyond 10 per cent of the capital of the bank. This will prevent any tendency to unload bonds upon the market and to depress their price. It will, indeed, tend to increase the value of the present form of bond-secured currency by making it a necessary prerequisite for obtaining the new currency. If all the banks in the United States having circulation secured by bonds on November 30, 1900, should take advantage of such a provision, they would be able to issue about \$92,000,000 in additional circulating notes.

It is proposed that this system may be gradually expanded at intervals of three years, until at the end of six years the new class of circulation not secured by bonds may equal four-fifths of the amount of bonds pledged to secure the existing form of circulation, but shall not exceed 40 per cent of banking capital. This opportunity will be afforded during the first three years to test the principle of the new circulation upon a limited scale, but it may be expanded at the end of that time to double the amount first allowed, and within three years more to four times the amount. This increase is to remain, however, under the complete control of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency. They are not required to issue the guaranteed bank notes to any bank whose solvency and the soundness of whose judgment they distrust. The direct consent of the Secretary of the Treasury is required to broaden the system at the end of three years, and this consent may be refused if he is not satisfied with the workings of the system.

How the new notes are guaranteed.—The safety of the new circulation in case of the failure of the bank issuing the notes is insured by the tax which constitutes the safety fund. This tax is at the rate of one-half of 1 per cent per year upon the amount of the notes in actual circulation. It is paid into a common fund which is available to pay the losses on the notes of failed banks. Whenever a bank fails having these notes in circulation, they are to be redeemed in full from the fund as they reach the Treasury, but the fund will be entitled to reimbursement from the assets of the bank, as they are

settled, in the same ratio as other creditors. This fund will be maintained, by means of the taxes paid, at 5 per cent of the amount of the guaranteed bank notes outstanding, and the surplus will be covered into the Treasury of the United States as the share of the public in the profits of issuing notes.

Experience has shown that a fund of this character will be much more than sufficient to meet all possible demands upon it. The sum collected by the Government of the United States in taxes upon circulation at the rate of 1 per cent a year from the organization of the national banking system in 1863 to the close of the fiscal year 1900 was \$87,186,868. The outstanding notes of all banks which failed during this period were \$22,423,080. If the proceeds of the taxes had constituted a safety fund, therefore, and the notes of the failed banks had been paid in full from this fund, the taxes would cover the losses nearly four times over. As a matter of fact, the calculations of Comptroller Dawes show that the dividends paid to the creditors of failed banks have averaged 75.03 per cent.

If this proportion of 75 per cent had been recovered upon these notes, the actual draft upon the safety fund would have been \$5,005,770, or less than one-fiftieth part of the amount paid into the fund.

A tax of one-fiftieth of 1 per cent upon circulation, therefore, would cover all the losses upon circulating notes indicated by the experience of the national banking system if there had been no bonded security.

It is proposed, however, as a matter of abundant safety, to make this fund seven times as large, but to avoid the accumulation of a large idle fund the surplus will be paid into the Treasury when it is not needed. In case of heavy drafts upon the fund, however, the Treasury would be obliged to reimburse the fund for the amount received by the Government, but would not be liable for a penny raised from other sources of taxation for the current expenses of the Government.

How the notes would retire when not needed.—It is desirable that notes of this character, resting upon the general assets of the issuing bank, should respond in volume to changes in business conditions; that they should get into circulation quickly and in sufficient quantities when they are needed, and should be retired from circulation when they are not needed. This end will be accomplished under the proposed plan by the disposition of the banks to put their own notes in circulation at the expense of those of other banks. The guaranteed bank notes will not be available for cash reserves, and will, therefore, be sent to the Treasury for redemption when they fall into the hands of other banks. They will then be canceled and retired. The frequent calls upon the issuing banks to restore their redemption fund will lead them to refrain from reissuing notes when they are not called for by the volume of their banking business.

When a bank is making large loans under a condition of business activity its notes will be rapidly called for and will be loaned at a profit. When business becomes dull, on the other hand, notes will pile up on its hands, it will have an abundant supply of other money with which to make loans, and will not be tempted to issue its own notes. Thus elasticity, or the adaptation of the volume of money to the needs of business, will be accomplished automatically under the proposed system. It is proposed, in order to facilitate the redemption and retirement of notes, that redemption agencies may be established by the Secretary of the Treasury at the different subtreasuries of the United States, in order that the banks may not be deterred by the cost of shipment from sending notes in for redemption.

Thus the need of some means of increasing the paper currency is plain. A simple and modest step toward reaching this result has been pointed out, whose safety is assured, and the Republican party is pledged by its national platform and the declaration of its Chief Executive to put some such plan in execution.

EXTRACTS FROM REPUBLICAN STATE PLATFORMS IN FAVOR OF AN ELASTIC CURRENCY.

Indiana (April 25, 1900).—Our best hopes for the continued employment of labor lies in the domination of the world's markets by American agricultural and mechanical products. Low interest rates are potent factors in the extension of American commerce and industry, at home and abroad. The wise financial legislation of the Republican party has largely secured these results. We therefore congratulate the American people in that the Republican party has kept its beneficent pledge for the maintenance of the gold standard and the parity of all our forms of money by comprehensive, courageous legislation. The Republican party has always stood and now stands for money laws that benefit all our people alike, without preference of one over another, the borrower as well as the lender, and such as equalize and lower the rates of interest throughout the country. And to this end we favor legislation authorizing elasticity in our bank currency for the benefit of our producers—the laborer, the farmer, and the manufacturer, and for the general commerce of our people, under the guidance and control of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Massachusetts (April 26, 1900).—We believe that monetary laws should consider the interests of the borrower as well as the lender, should tend to equalize the rates of interest in all parts of the country, at all seasons of the year, to the farmer, the manufacturer, and the exporter, and should make it possible for our people to obtain and extend credit on terms as favorable and at rates as low as their foreign competitors. The Republican party, therefore, pledges itself to support such amendments to the banking laws as will provide a flexible and sufficient medium of exchange, to the end that capital may obtain fair returns, that American commerce may be enlarged, and that labor may be assured of steady employment and of the largest possible share in the fruits of our expanding trade.

Minnesota (May 16, 1900).—The Republican party stands for money laws that benefit all the people alike, the borrower as well as the lender, laws that tend to reduce and equalize interest rates in all parts of the country for the benefit of our producers—the farmer, the laborer, the manufacturer, and the merchant. To this end we favor a flexible currency that will respond to the needs of commerce and industry.

Maryland (May 9, 1900).—We favor such additional modification of the banking laws as will still further promote the interests of the borrower of money as well as the lender, and will provide a flexible and sufficient medium of exchange for the needs of all sections. We believe that the constantly expanding business of the country makes necessary an increased elasticity in the currency system, and that further legislation in this direction would give a stimulus to the industries and interests of the whole country, and especially to the South, by affording the necessary credit facilities for promoting the increased production and export of its staple products.

West Virginia (May 8, 1900).—The Republican party now stands, as it has always stood, for money laws that benefit all the people alike, the borrower as well as the lender, the laborer as well as the employer, and such as equalize and lower the rates of interest. We favor legislation that will promote elasticity in the currency for the benefit of the producer, the laborer, the farmer, the manufacturer, and for the general commerce of our people.

Kentucky (May 17, 1900).—We favor carefully guarded and practical laws to secure elasticity in our bank currency, so as to provide for a constant supply of enough currency for all borrowers for business uses, at low and steady rates of interest, for the good of every worker, producer, farmer, manufacturer, and business man, and for the general business of our people.

Missouri (May 16, 1900).—The Republican party has always stood, and now stands, for money laws that secure safety and benefit to all our people alike,

without preference of one over another, and such as tend to equalize and lower the rates of interest throughout the country. And to this end we favor wise legislation for the improvement of our currency for the benefit of our producers, the laborer, the farmer, and the manufacturer, and for the encouragement and promotion of the general commerce of our people.

North Dakota (May 16, 1900).—We assert that the Republican party now stands, as it has always stood, for money laws that benefit all the people alike, the borrower as well as the lender, the laborer as well as the employer, and such as equalize and lower the rates of interest. We favor legislation that will promote elasticity in the currency for the benefit of the producer, the laborer, the farmer, the manufacturer, and for the general commerce of our people.

Wyoming (May 16, 1900).—The Republican party has always stood and now stands for money laws that benefit all our people alike, that consider the interest of the borrower as well as the lender, that tend to equalize the rate of interest in all parts of the country at all seasons of the year, to the farmer, the stockman, the merchant, and the manufacturer, and that make it possible for our people to obtain and extend credit on terms as favorable and at rates as low as the foreign competitors.

The Republican party of Wyoming therefore pledges itself to support such further legislation as will provide a flexible and sufficient medium of exchange, to the end that capital may continue to obtain fair returns, that American commerce may be enlarged, and that labor may be assured of steady employment and the largest possible share in the fruits of our expanding trade.

OUR PAPER CURRENCY—THE NEED FOR MAKING IT RESPONSIVE TO THE VARYING NEEDS OF BUSINESS AT ALL SEASONS AND IN ALL SECTIONS.

We recognize that interest rates are a potent factor in production and business activity, and for the purpose of further equalizing and of further lowering the rates of interest we favor such monetary legislation as will enable the varying needs of the seasons and of all sections to be promptly met, in order that trade may be evenly sustained, labor steadily employed, and commerce enlarged. (Republican national platform of 1900.)

The party in power is committed to such legislation as will better make the currency responsive to the varying needs of business at all seasons and in all sections. (Annual message of President McKinley to Congress, December 3, 1900.)

Post-Office Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. MOODY,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, February 5, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13729) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902—

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY C. SMITH] said yesterday, in the course of his excellent speech, that the members of the postal commission owed to the House something more than was contained in their report. It seems to me that he was right. I therefore avail myself of the opportunity given in general debate to speak upon the appropriation of thirty-nine and a half million dollars for the transportation of mail by railroads, contained in the pending bill. I do this, although the amendment offered by him to change the law upon the subject of railway mail pay has been met by a point of order, which, under the rules of the House, must be sustained.

Nevertheless it is wise for us to seize upon this occasion for the discussion of the question. I do not discuss the question Mr. Chairman, from choice. I would very much prefer not to do so, for I realize that any adequate discussion can prove neither interesting nor entertaining to the members. The nature of the question is such that it can be better discussed in the form of a written report or essay than in that of a speech upon this floor. The three bulky volumes of testimony which were taken by the commission, it is not likely that many gentlemen will ever read. It is utterly impossible to discuss the question in all its details within the limits of time which the rules of the House permit to me, or of which I would avail myself under any indulgence which the House might grant. Therefore I have set to myself only the task of touching upon the aspects of the case which seem to me to be the leading and salient ones, with the hope, at least, that I may be able to disclose to the House the real question in controversy. It is not my purpose to take violently one side or the other of the controversy, but rather to go over it in such a manner as may be (although I am not sure that it will be) of service to such members of the House as care to study the question and form an opinion upon it.

I have said many times that the loss in the administration of the postal service in the decade beginning in 1890 was \$110,000,000. The largest single item of postal expenditure is the item for the transportation of mails by railroads. At the time when the commission was created, this item had increased from six and a half millions of dollars in 1873 to thirty-four and a half millions of dollars in 1898. On the other hand, the ton mileage of mail had increased from twenty-four and a half millions in 1873 to two hun-

dred and seventy-two and three-quarters millions in 1898. I am speaking here, as I shall generally throughout my remarks, in round, though roughly approximate, numbers. In other words, while the payment for mail transportation had increased 425.44 per cent in that period, the work done by the railroads which earned the payments had increased 1,004.64 per cent. Moreover, since 1878 there has been no change in the law prescribing the rate of payment for railway mail transportation. We shall see later that the criticism which this fact would naturally invoke is somewhat disarmed, if it is not met, by a consideration of the nature of the law itself.

These conditions which I have described were apt to produce a public opinion that the question deserved the attention of Congress. Although the commission, which has just concluded its labors, had other functions than that of inquiry into the railway mail pay, it was undoubtedly that question which led up to the creation of the commission.

I know of no better way to begin the discussion of the subject than by a consideration of the law itself which is under criticism. I doubt if many members of the House know what it is or understand its effect or working. I am sure that I did not until after I had become a member of the commission. If you will bear with me I will read the law so that my comments upon it may be intelligible. Before doing so, however, let me say that up to the time of the passage of the act of 1873 the attempt to regulate railway mail pay had been by a series of makeshifts without very much of scientific foundation.

The history of the subject is set forth by Mr. Victor J. Bradley, superintendent of the Railway Mail Service for the middle states, on page 144, volume 2, of the report of the commission. The law of 1873 has been amended twice; first by a 10 per cent horizontal reduction in 1876, and again by a 5 per cent horizontal reduction in 1878, making in all a horizontal reduction in rates of 14½ per cent. So I will read the law as it stands to-day, affected by the two amendments of which I have spoken, and use for that purpose the codification bill which passed the House the other day, which correctly expresses the present law. It is as follows:

That the pay per mile per annum shall not exceed the following rates, namely: On routes carrying their whole length an average weight of mails per day of 300 pounds, \$42.75; 500 pounds, \$64.12; 1,000 pounds, \$85.50; 1,500 pounds, \$106.87; 2,000 pounds, \$128.25; 3,500 pounds, \$149.62; 5,000 pounds, \$171; and for every additional 2,000 pounds, \$21.37, the average weight to be ascertained in every case by the actual weighing of the mails by employees of the Post-Office Department for such a number of successive working days, not less than thirty, at such times as the Postmaster-General may direct, not less frequently than once in every four years; and the weights taken and the results so ascertained shall be stated and verified to the Postmaster-General by said employees, under such instructions as he may consider just to the Post-Office Department and the railroad company.

Gentlemen will note in passing that we pay \$42.75 per mile per annum for carrying 200 pounds of mail daily when only that amount is carried, and about half that sum, viz, \$21.37, for carrying every 2,000 pounds of mail carried in excess of 5,000 pounds. I shall consider this aspect of the law a little more in detail later, for it is of the greatest importance. Let us now analyze the law.

Let me call to the attention of the House several important features of it, all of which bear, in more or less degree, upon the proper solution of the problem.

In the first place, the statute prescribes a maximum rate: "The pay per mile per annum shall not exceed the following rates." It is within the authority of the Post-Office Department, if it were able to do so, to pay less than the sum prescribed by statute. I have often said, and I believe it to be true, that if we had an ideally perfect Second Assistant Postmaster-General, who could retain his office for a long period of years and could be allowed to act upon this question freely and without interference from any quarter, we should work out, under the present law, as near a just standard of payment to the railroads as human imperfections would permit.

Do not understand me as meaning by this any criticism upon the present accomplished occupant of that office or any criticism upon his predecessors. My purpose was merely to illustrate the possibilities under the law and point out that the law itself is so framed that the Government, taking all possible advantages that exist under it, could get just as low a rate of payment as economic conditions would permit. In point of fact, however, generally, if not almost or quite universally, the maximum rate has been paid to the railroads, because wherever the opportunity to exact more from the railroads has appeared, the Government has chosen to exact greater service rather than a lower rate of payment.

A second feature of the law is that it provides for the payment for mail carried over the whole length of the route. Let me read the exact expression:

On routes carrying their whole length an average weight of mail per day, etc.

It is important for us to consider what these words mean, because I think they carry very little meaning to the mind upon the mere reading of them. The payment for the transportation of

mail is neither based on weight alone nor on distance alone. It is based upon weight multiplied by distance; in other words, it is based upon neither tonnage nor mileage, but upon ton mileage. Perhaps no better way of describing this exists than by taking an actual or an assumed instance of ascertaining mail pay. I find one on page 203, volume 2, of the report. Let me insert it in the RECORD without reading:

Weighing sheet for assumed route.

Station.	Distance between stations.	Weight of mail.		Weight carried between stations.	Pound mileage of mail.	Average weight carried over whole route.
		Taken on.	Put off.			
	Miles.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.		Pounds.
A		5,000				
B	10	7,000	4,000	5,000	50,000	
C	12	3,000	5,000	8,000	96,000	
D	28		6,000	6,000	168,000	
Total and result.	50	15,000	15,000		314,000	6,100

We assume a railroad with terminals 50 miles apart. The train starts at Station A with 5,000 pounds of mail and travels 10 miles to Station B. That 5,000 pounds of mail multiplied by 10 gives the pound-mileage—50,000 pounds. At Station B 4,000 pounds is put off and 7,000 pounds is taken on, leaving 8,000 pounds carried 12 miles to Station C. This 8,000 multiplied by 12 gives 96,000 as the pound-mileage. At the next station 3,000 pounds is taken on and 5,000 put off. Consequently to the fourth and last station there is carried 6,000 pounds of mail, which, multiplied by the distance between the stations, 28 miles, makes 168,000 pounds-mileage. We get, by simple arithmetical process, which I will not stop to describe, the average carried one way on the whole route as 6,100 pounds. Beginning at the other end of the route, making the return trip, we obtain by the same process the average carried that way on the route.

Adding these two sums together gives us the daily weight over the whole route. The weighings are conducted for thirty-five days and the average daily weight over the whole route is thus obtained. We then examine the law and find what is the rate of pay per mile per annum which the weight obtained calls for. That being found, it is multiplied by the length in miles of the route, which gives us the annual compensation for the carriage of mail.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. While the gentleman is on that line of thought, will he permit me a question?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Did the commission ascertain with any degree of certainty the average cost per pound of transporting the mails?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. We did. I shall come to that point later.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. May I ask the gentleman who prepared that table to which he referred?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Adams.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. That makes it authentic for the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I will say that the greatest assistance given to the commission has come from Mr. Adams. The only person who has rivaled him in any respect is the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD]. Those two gentlemen brought this question to a platform where gentlemen can discuss and disagree about it without losing their temper, because I think I shall demonstrate to the House later on that the controversy has come to be confined within a very narrow limit.

Another thing that is to be noted about this law is that it deals with railway routes and not with railway corporations or railway systems. The Postmaster-General designates these routes. In the last fiscal year there were 2,668 of them. Therefore any railroad system may have vastly different rates of pay for the different routes upon which the service is performed. Take, for instance, the Boston and Maine system in my own part of the country. There is one route, between Wakefield and Peabody, where the pay per ton per mile is \$2.47, while between Boston and Portland it is only 8 cents. On the Pennsylvania road there is one route, between Three Rivers and Pottersdale, where the Government pays \$8.55 per ton per mile, while between New York and Philadelphia it pays about 7.2 cents per ton per mile. Or, in other words, Mr. Chairman, we pay 122 times as much upon one route as upon the other. These great payments, however, are exceptions, and grow out of the fact that where the mail is less than 200 pounds per day the same payment is made as for 200 pounds, thus much increasing the rate per ton. A fairer comparison can be made by taking the case of exactly 200 pounds. We pay the railroad company, for instance, for transporting the mails between New York and Philadelphia about 7.2 cents per ton per mile, while we pay any railroad that carries only 200 pounds per day over the entire route \$1.17 per

ton per mile. This feature the House will perceive to be of much importance in the discussion of this question.

The next feature to which I wish to call your attention is that this part of the law neglects entirely the element of space occupied and bases the rate of payment for transportation upon weight multiplied by distance—upon the ton mileage, in other words. That is of much importance, because in another part of the law it is provided that "every railroad company carrying the mail shall carry on any train which may run over its road, and without extra charge therefor, all available matter directed to be carried thereon."

In other words, the Government of the United States, within the limits of the number of trains run, may dictate the number of daily transportations of mails that there shall be, and therefore the amount of mail that shall be carried in each individual case of transportation. For instance, to use a familiar illustration, the 300,000 pounds of mail transported daily between New York and Philadelphia is carried in 140 trains, although 26 of the trains carry 90 per cent of the entire mail.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that two trains actually carry the bulk of that mail?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I am not informed as to that. I should say not, however. But the gentleman may have looked into the matter more recently and acquired information that I have not discovered.

The next feature, Mr. Chairman, to which I wish to call your attention briefly is that which provides that the compensation shall be ascertained by weighing the mail for such a number of successive working days, not less than thirty, at such times as the Postmaster-General may direct, not less frequently than once in four years. Now, these weighings are made, as I have just stated, once in every four years, although they may be made in cases of emergency which may arise—where great changes have occurred in the mail transportation either one way or the other—at other intervals to be fixed by the Postmaster-General. It depends entirely upon his judgment in the matter. He can dictate when, in his judgment, this weighing shall take place. For instance, if the Pennsylvania Railroad system, and I use that as a convenient illustration because it is near us, if a weighing occurs upon that system this year and the weight is ascertained upon the basis of thirty-five days' weighing, no matter whether there might be an increase or a decrease, that weight would be the basis of compensation for the four years to come. This would be the basis of compensation for the railroad company during that period of four years unless the change in the amount of mail was so marked as to call for a new weighing by order of the Postmaster-General.

The railroads have complained very bitterly of this condition of affairs, and, in my judgment, not entirely without justice, as the general tendency of the mail is toward an increase. Wherever this increase occurs, the railroads are carrying weight for which they are not paid. On the other hand, gentlemen will observe that it is true that these quadrennial weighings are very susceptible to fraud or error, and instances have been brought to the attention of the commission where fraud was committed in the weighings. Gentlemen will observe that the effect of successful fraud is multiplied many fold. The object of the weighings is to get the daily weight, and they are spread over a sufficient length of time to obtain a fair average. Therefore, if the weight is fraudulently increased, the fraud is multiplied by the days in the year and again by the four years during which the weight is used as a basis of payment. Moreover, where the fraud is committed by actually stuffing the mails during the weighing period, the fraudulent matter may go over some other and innocent route and increase its pay in the same way. You may inquire whether these frauds are frequent, or whether they are likely to occur and escape the detection of the Government officials. I can state, for one, that I do not believe they are frequent. I do not think they can occur without coming under the notice of some one charged with responsibility in connection with the matter. If, of course, there is collusion between those who desire to stuff the mails in order to secure this improper weight and the Government officials who are doing the weighing, the fraud may happen to escape detection. We had a little instance of this kind which came under our own observation. A man had built a short railroad and desired to get good pay for transporting the mails over it. He went to all of the newspapers in San Francisco and subscribed for a large number of copies for a period of some months, and had them transmitted in the mail over his road at the time when the weighing was to take place. Of course he would have received the additional compensation resulting from the increased weight. But not only that—these papers not only went into the mails that were carried over his own road, but went over four or five other roads, with the result of increasing their compensation as well. That fraud did not succeed, however, in the end. What gave it a chance of success was because the owner of the railroad had conspired with a Government official who was charged with the duty of observing and inspecting the weighing of the mails.

But through the efforts of the commission, I think it may be fairly said, that subject was brought to the attention of the Post-Office Department and was rectified. I will say again that I believe no great frauds in the weighing can occur without being detected by officials of the Government, if they are honest. And, as the gentleman from California [Mr. Loub] suggests, they must be known not only to one, but to very many men, and it is improbable that frauds upon any scale that would be of any consequence could occur without their detection by the Government or some officials of the Government. By a recent act the fraudulent increase of the mail during the weighing period is made a criminal offense.

The last feature of the law to which I desire to call attention is the most important thing in it, and that is that under its provisions the rate of pay decreases automatically as the weight of the mail increases. I will not repeat the statute which, as we have seen, starting with a compensation of \$42.75 per mile per annum, where the daily weight is 200 pounds, lowers by stages until for every 2,000 pounds over 5,000 pounds the compensation is \$21.37. Professor Adams has translated the words of the law into terms of ton mileage and actual pay per mile per annum in a table which I will insert, but not read.

Summary showing rate per ton and revenue per mile under the law of 1873.

Average weight of mail carried over entire route per day.	Rate per ton-mile of mail.	Pay per mile of route per annum.	Average weight of mail carried over entire route per day.	Rate per ton-mile of mail.	Pay per mile of route per annum.	Average weight of mail carried over entire route per day.	Rate per ton-mile of mail.	Pay per mile of route per annum.
Pounds.			Pounds.			Pounds.		
200	\$1.17123	\$42.75	2,400	\$0.30651	\$134.25	20,000	\$0.09113	\$332.62
250	1.02466	46.75	2,500	.29863	136.25	21,000	.08924	342.00
300	.92694	50.75	2,600	.29136	138.25	22,000	.08817	354.00
350	.85714	54.75	2,700	.28490	139.25	23,000	.08657	363.37
400	.80479	58.75	2,800	.27842	141.25	24,000	.08570	375.37
450	.76408	62.75	2,900	.27087	143.25	25,000	.08433	384.75
500	.72774	64.12	3,000	.26347	144.25	30,000	.08027	439.50
550	.69878	66.12	3,500	.23425	149.62	35,000	.07697	491.62
600	.67128	69.12	4,000	.21592	157.62	40,000	.07485	546.37
650	.64958	71.12	4,500	.20167	165.62	45,000	.07288	598.50
700	.63423	74.12	5,000	.18740	171.00	50,000	.07159	653.25
750	.62616	76.12	5,500	.17634	177.00	55,000	.07027	705.37
800	.61495	79.12	6,000	.16712	183.00	60,000	.06942	760.12
850	.60297	81.12	6,500	.15933	189.00	65,000	.06847	812.25
900	.59128	84.12	7,000	.15059	192.37	70,000	.06787	867.00
950	.58315	85.50	7,500	.14493	198.37	75,000	.06715	919.12
1,000	.46849	85.60	8,000	.13998	204.37	80,000	.06670	973.87
1,100	.45081	90.50	8,500	.13502	210.37	85,000	.06614	1,026.00
1,200	.43607	95.50	9,000	.13014	213.75	90,000	.06580	1,080.75
1,300	.42300	100.50	9,500	.12675	218.75	95,000	.06534	1,132.87
1,400	.41292	105.50	10,000	.12370	223.75	100,000	.06508	1,187.62
1,500	.39041	106.87	11,000	.11712	235.12	125,000	.06372	1,453.50
1,600	.38313	111.87	12,000	.11284	247.12	150,000	.06290	1,722.00
1,700	.37671	116.87	13,000	.10811	256.50	175,000	.06224	1,987.87
1,800	.37100	121.87	14,000	.10509	268.50	200,000	.06182	2,256.37
1,900	.36590	126.87	15,000	.10151	277.87	225,000	.06142	2,522.25
2,000	.35137	128.25	16,000	.09827	289.87	250,000	.06117	2,790.75
2,100	.34725	129.25	17,000	.09645	299.25	275,000	.06090	3,056.62
2,200	.33390	131.25	18,000	.09475	311.25	300,000	.06073	3,325.12
2,300	.31745	133.25	19,000	.09247	330.62	Limit.	.05850

NOTE.—The average weights and amounts of pay per mile per annum in black figures are explicitly prescribed in the laws mentioned; the others are computed from these according to the weights prescribed by the Postmaster-General as warranting the addition of \$1 to the annual pay per mile, these weights being 12 pounds where the daily average weight of mail is between 200 and 500 pounds, 20 pounds where the daily average weight of mail is between 500 and 1,000 pounds, 30 pounds where the daily average weight of mail is between 1,000 and 1,500 pounds, 20 pounds where the daily average weight of mail is between 1,500 and 2,000 pounds, 60 pounds where the daily average weight of mail is between 2,000 and 3,500 pounds, 60 pounds where the daily average weight of mail is between 3,500 and 5,000 pounds, 80 pounds where the daily average weight of mail is above 5,000 pounds. Amounts not warranting the addition of an entire dollar are neglected.

The laws prescribe that for each additional 2,000 pounds above 5,000 pounds there shall be paid \$21.37 per mile of route per annum.

If I were to undertake to illustrate this automatic operation of the statute by a chart, as Professor Adams has done, you would see that beginning with 200 pounds the rate of pay as the weight increases goes down very rapidly until you reach 30,000 pounds, and you would find that the rate of decrease appeared as a parabolic curve, always tending to approach the base line of 5.856 cents per ton per mile, but never actually reaching that line. This fact arises from the consideration that all mail in excess of 5,000 pounds per day is carried for 5.856 cents per ton per mile, but that in any case a part—though of constantly decreasing relative importance—is carried at a higher rate. Under the operations of the law something over 60 per cent of the mail is carried for under 10 cents per ton per mile.

Now, one other consideration with regard to the law, and then I shall come to discuss some other branches of the subject. I said that the part of the law which I read neglected space entirely as a basis of payment. But space is recognized in another part of the law. It is recognized in the provisions for the payment for pos-

tal cars, which the statute provides shall be at a rate not to exceed \$25 per mile per annum for cars 40 feet in length, and so on, until we come to \$50 per mile per annum for 60-foot cars. This payment is in addition to the weight payment which I have described. A great deal of criticism has been addressed to the payment which is made for the postal cars. Before coming to that, I should like to call your attention to the historical reason for the use of postal cars. It is contained in the report of Mr. Bradley, a very valuable report submitted to the commission at its request. It will be found on page 156 of the second volume of testimony. I do not turn to it at this moment, and I will not undertake to find it now.

Mail used to be distributed and sorted in so-called "distribution offices," and the mail was transported on the railroads in closed pouches. There was no distribution of any consequence there. It was taken to a distributing office and there assorted and sent along again toward its destination. I now find the statement of Mr. Bradley, which is as follows:

The railway post office service, or, in other words, the distribution of mails in transit, was begun in 1864. Previous to that time there were no full postal cars, and no attempt to sort mail in transit on the principal lines of railway. There were in existence previous to that time employees of the Post-Office Department called route agents, or mail-route messengers (in some cases these were subsidized baggagemen), who handled the local mail bags, exchanging them at the way stations, and who sometimes handled direct packages of letters made up by one post-office for another post-office; but there was no sorting of mails in transit as the term is now understood. On the trunk lines there was no attempt at general distribution of mail.

The system had been that the large post-offices of the country were designated as distributing post-offices, and were given an additional allowance of clerical force for that purpose. These post-offices sorted the through mails as they found time for it, and made up this mail for other distributing post-offices, where of course it was again delayed for re-separation, to be transmitted to some other distributing post-office, until it finally got near the locality of its destination. This system required the mail to remain over at these several distributing post-offices for distribution, and occupying several days in transit, where perhaps twenty-four hours would now be sufficient.

Postal cars were devised to give room to the Government to sort the mail during its transit. That accounts for the origin of postal cars, and it becomes a very important feature when we come to consider the general question of reduction of mail pay.

After having paid for the transportation of the mail why should we pay something extra for the cars in which it is carried? At first sight it seemed very clear to me that we ought not to do so. Having paid for the carriage of the mail itself, which was carried upon a train, it seemed to me that there was no reason or justice in paying something in addition for a car in which to carry it. But when we come to consider the reason which brought these cars into existence, and when we come to consider what they are actually doing now, I think we shall be convinced, as almost all members of the commission were convinced and as the commission's expert was convinced, that the pay for railway postal cars was a just payment for a just service. To this extent I agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLEMING]. There is no logic in the distinction between apartment cars for which we do not pay extra and postal cars for which we do. They are substantially alike except in size. I am not, however, for that reason willing to increase the pay for the sake of the logic.

It will appear later on that we carry, on an average, about 2 tons of mail in one of these postal cars. The new 60-foot postal cars that are now being made, weigh from 80,000 to 100,000 pounds, and we are asking the railroad to carry a car having a dead non-paying weight of 80,000 to 100,000 pounds simply for the purpose of carrying in it 2 tons of mail which earns a compensation. If any one of us desired to cross the continent and were willing to take our chances in an ordinary car, we should expect to pay one rate of fare. If two or three of us thought we ought to have a whole car to ourselves for any purpose which might suit our pleasure or comfort or convenience, we should expect to pay another rate of fare. And that is the theory upon which the railway postal car service is paid for, as an extra item in the accounts.

Gentlemen say, "Why, a postal car costs only about \$5,000, and you pay more than that each year for its rental." Well, we do not pay for rental of cars. It is an illustration of how words will serve to conceal the real truth. I suppose any railway in the country would build us postal cars by the thousands and rent them to us for a small per cent upon the cost of their construction. But what we pay is not for rent of the car. We pay for hauling the car. We pay for the labor, the coal, the maintenance of the track, and the thousand and one expenses which go into the expense account of the operation of a railroad. And when we come to consider all those questions and consider the further fact that the pay for a postal car averages just about what is paid for the carriage of a ton of mail, we see that the problem assumes an entirely different aspect. It is, in effect, guaranteeing to every postal car which a railroad operates, over and above the payment for the mail which it actually does carry, the payment for another ton of mail which it does not carry. The reason why we make that guaranty is the same reason that would control any one of us if we sought to have for our own convenience a whole section instead of a half section in a sleeping car. We pay for the room

in which to work conveniently in the one case and to sleep conveniently in the other.

Why talk about the rent of a car—the rent of a postal car? You might as well talk about the rent of a Pullman sleeping car. I pay \$6 for a section, and I usually occupy one in going from here to Boston, for one night. I could get a room in one of the best hotels in the country for that amount. I pay \$6 for a little box hardly big enough to catch a rat and hold it. Why do I pay that with all the inconvenience of a small room? It is because I am traveling in the meantime. I am not paying merely for the space I occupy or merely for the weight the railroad is carrying, but paying because they are carrying me over the country in an apartment that is provided for that purpose. I expect to pay more than I would have to pay if I were hiring a room of the same size in the best hotel in the country, standing upon the most expensive land.

Mr. GROW. You are traveling while you are sleeping.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I am traveling while I am sleeping, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania suggests, and occupying much more space than I am entitled to as mere freight.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. If the gentleman will permit me, right there. The railroad postal car is nothing more nor less than a post-office on wheels, a moving post-office.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for the suggestion. Gentlemen treat this question as if the Government were hiring a stationary freight car, when, in fact, we are hiring a traveling post-office.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Any offense committed against the postal laws in a postal car is the same as if it were committed in any of the post-offices of the country. Now, the question I wanted to ask the gentleman is this: If, having the post-office on wheels, a traveling post-office, the gentleman does not believe that it would be to the best interests of the Government to own their own traveling post-offices, as they do own the post-offices throughout the length and breadth of the country, as a matter of expediency, as a matter of economy, and pay the railways for hauling these traveling post-offices?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Well, in that case I would say to the gentleman from Texas, the railroad might pay us mileage, though doubtless we should be required to guarantee a certain minimum weight of mails to be carried in each car. We looked somewhat into the business arrangement which exists between the railroads and those furnishing cars. The Pullman Car Company furnishes cars to the railroad for the transportation of its passengers, the Pullman Company collecting the fares for berths and seats, and the railroad company receiving the ticket fares. The railroad companies pay 2 or 3 cents to the Pullman Company per mile run, or instead of paying mileage keep the cars in repair. The companies in Chicago, like Armour & Co., also furnish their own cars for the transportation of meat. Armour & Co. receive mileage of sixth-tenths to three-fourths of 1 cent per mile run. On the other hand, it appears that they guarantee a minimum load of 10 tons to a car; that is to say, they pay freight on 10 tons, no matter how much less is in the car, and pay the extra freight upon anything over 10 tons. For reasons which I can not dwell upon now, the Pullman service is peculiar, but without doubt, if we should furnish the postal cars and guarantee a minimum load, the railroads would pay us mileage.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Does the gentleman think it would be best to do that?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I am not prepared to go that far. We made some investigation of the subject, but not sufficient investigation to warrant a final conclusion. The evidence, as far as it went, tended to convince us all that the change would not be an advantageous one. If we made the change, we should undoubtedly have to guarantee a minimum load, which might lead to consequences quite unforeseen. It is entirely practicable for the Government to own its own postal cars. At least it seems so to me. We could have them constructed, say by the Pullman Car Company, as cheaply as a railroad could. An arrangement could be entered into with the railroads to keep the cars in repair, just as they now in many cases keep the Pullman cars in repair. Still I think I can say that none of us were impressed with the advisability of making that change.

I have now, Mr. Chairman, completed all that I desire to say upon the nature of the law prescribing railway mail pay, the theory upon which it is based, and its practical operation. I have shown that, primarily, compensation is based upon the weight of the mails multiplied by the distance which they are carried, and that the rate lowers automatically upon any given route as the weight increases; that the automatic reduction proceeds quite rapidly until the weight of mail reaches 30,000 pounds per day, and then ceases to decrease rapidly as the weight increases beyond that point; that the Government reserves the power to determine how frequently and upon what trains mail shall be transported, and thus in effect determines the load upon the car, and

that when mail is transported upon a full postal car an additional compensation is given for hauling the car, which is a tacit recognition of the justice of paying for space occupied but not filled with paying freight.

I now come immediately to the work of the commission. When we began the work, there were in existence and supposed to be true, certain statistics which had largely affected public opinion. The statistics came from the Post-Office Department itself. Gentlemen who based their reasoning upon those statistics had a good excuse for doing so because they were issued and put in circulation by the Department itself. By those statistics it appeared that the average rate paid to railroads for transporting the mails was 6.53 cents per pound, that the average haul was 328 miles, and that we paid, on an average, 40 cents per ton per mile to the railroads for transporting the mails. Gentlemen may carry these figures, if they please, in their minds, as they are important. We went staggering along under the weight of those statistics until the summer of 1899. While we suspected that they were false, there did not seem to be anybody who could demonstrate that they were not true. At that period we employed Professor Adams to assist us in our investigation. He was, as gentlemen know, professor of economic science in the University of Michigan and statistician of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that I never came in contact with a gentleman who impressed me more favorably than Professor Adams did and does. He brought order out of chaos. He entirely changed the basis of the discussion of the question. Whoever undertakes to discuss it upon either side hereafter must discuss it on the lines that Professor Adams laid down. The amount of aid he rendered the commission and the public in the discussion and deliberation on this question can not be overestimated. [Applause.] He began a careful study of the voluminous evidence which we had taken, as well as all the facts which he independently ascertained for himself. He submitted his report to us in New York, just before the meeting of Congress in December, 1899.

In the meantime another event had occurred which materially aided in the correction of inaccurate statistics. From year to year the reports of the Postmasters-General had contained figures showing the weight of the mail. Except in the case of paying second-class matter, which is a known figure, because it is always weighed to ascertain the postage to be paid, these figures were estimates, and the estimates were obtained in this way: In 1890 Mr. Wanamaker ordered a count and weighing of the mails at all points of origin for a period of seven days. With the results of these weighings as a basis, a calculation of the weight for the whole year was made. From year to year after, the supposed weight of mail was found by estimating an increase proportional to the increase in postal revenue. For reasons which I will not recount, we distrusted the statistics thus obtained, and suggested to the Department the advisability of causing new weighings to be made. The Department cheerfully undertook the task and caused weighings to be made at every post-office in the country for a period of thirty-five days in October and November, 1899. Thus the actual amount of mail matter by classes originating in the United States during that period was ascertained.

From the length of time covered by these weighings and the careful methods adopted in their conduct, we believed that a substantially correct computation of the weight for the whole fiscal year could be and was made.

I will not dwell on the results obtained. They are set forth in full in the last report of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, where they may be readily consulted.

They demonstrate, in the words of that report, that the statistics obtained from the Wanamaker weighing "were unreliable and unsatisfactory." I will insert in the RECORD, without troubling the House by reading them, tables which show two surprising facts, namely: That 86 per cent of the total weight of mail matter is sent to railroads for transportation, and that 48 per cent of the matter for which we pay to the railroads transportation charges is mere equipment.

Statement showing estimate of the total amount of mail matter originating in the United States, by classes, and the proportion of the same sent to railroads.

Class.	Weight for 365 days.	Amount sent to railroads.	Difference, local mail.	Per cent to railroads.
	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	
First class.....	94,888,341	72,637,586	22,250,755	76.55
Second class.....	494,417,505	381,737,766	112,679,739	98.79
Second class, free.....	32,750,550	29,682,503	12,718,047	61.16
Third and fourth class.....	145,874,518	125,838,025	20,036,493	86.23
Government, free.....	96,132,082	86,466,748	9,665,334	89.94
Equipment.....	801,002,002	632,063,970	169,538,032	81.34
Foreign.....		8,348,582		100
Total.....	1,565,666,508	1,347,145,180	226,869,910	86.04

Per cent, by classes, of mail matter sent to railroads.

Class.	Weight for 35 days.	Estimated weight for 365 days.	Per cent of total weight.
	Pounds.	Pounds.	
First class	6,965,248	72,637,586	5.39
Second class	26,606,909	381,757,766	28.34
Second class, free	1,920,925	21,032,503	1.49
Third and fourth class	12,066,660	125,838,025	9.34
Foreign	800,549	8,348,582	.62
Government, free	8,291,332	86,496,748	6.42
Equipment	62,526,682	632,063,970	48.40
Total	129,178,305	1,347,145,180	100
Weight of mail matter from which a revenue is derived	56,430,366	588,581,959	43.69
Weight of mail matter from which no revenue is derived	72,738,939	758,563,221	56.31
Total	129,178,305	1,347,145,180	100

When the commission assembled in November, 1899, it was found that Mr. Bradley, Mr. Kruttschnitt, of the Southern Pacific, and Mr. Adams, working independently, had arrived at the conclusion that the commonly accepted statistics were erroneous. I shall speak more particularly of Mr. Adams' views.

Taking data which he procured himself, the testimony before the commission, and the results of the new weighing, Professor Adams demonstrated by his study of them the falsity of the statistics under which the public mind had been laboring. How great that falsity was I shall call to your attention by comparison of the new with the old statistics. It had been supposed that we were paying $6\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound as average payment to the railroads for the transportation of the mail. In point of fact we were paying $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.

Mr. COWHERD. What does the gentleman mean by the average payment—the average haul?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. No; taking the whole mail and dividing by it the total railway mail pay you get the average price paid per pound. Of course, a pound of mail going from here to Baltimore pays a very small fraction of that amount, and if it goes to San Francisco it pays more than the average; but the average is $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound. Further, we found that the haul, instead of being 328 miles, was 438 miles. We further found what is most important of all, that instead of paying 40 cents per ton per mile, we were only paying 12.56 cents per ton per mile. In other words, we were not paying one-third as much as the Post-Office Department had led the people of the country to believe we had been paying. Gentlemen can see at once that when that radical change in fundamental statistics was developed, the question assumed an entirely different aspect.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I may have misunderstood the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I thought he stated that the cost of transportation per mile—the general average—through the length and breadth of the country was 6.53 cents a pound.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. That is what it was supposed to be, but it is really $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, and instead of being 40 cents a ton per mile, which, of course, is the most significant figure, it is $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents, roughly speaking, per ton per mile.

Mr. MANN. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts to some figures in the report on the second-class matter, where your commission reports that there was paid for the second-class matter \$20,000,000 and over, for railway transportation, and that the amount of the second-class matter transported was 414,000,000 pounds, which, at $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound, would amount to less than \$12,000,000. I would like to ask the gentleman for an explanation.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Well, Mr. Chairman, at first the question of the gentleman from Illinois, I confess, staggered me. But we use equipment for second-class as for other classes of mail. We pay for the equipment as well as for the mail itself. We pay for the equipment, which is 48 per cent of what we do pay for. The mail is put into sacks, taken to the railroads, and the sacks or pouches are all weighed just as they would be if they were transported by freight or express. We pay for the equipment, and that would account for the difference in the figures. My figures deal with the actual weight. Then when we put it into the cars we have the added weight of the pouches and the sacks. We have to have pouches in which it is sorted and transported, and we have to pay for that additional weight.

Mr. MANN. The second-class matter is stated to be 58 per cent of the entire mail transported. This 414,000,000 pounds of second-class matter would have to have added considerable to it in the way of equipment.

Mr. LOUD. Double.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It would have to have a good

deal added to it, and taking the mail altogether, all classes, the weight of the equipment almost equals the weight of the mail, as I have shown.

Mr. LLOYD. Will the gentleman yield to me for an inquiry?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. LLOYD. Do I understand that the gentleman says that the difference between $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents and $6\frac{1}{2}$ cents per ton per mile is for carrying the mail in sacks, for the inclosure?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. No; I did not say that.

Mr. LLOYD. Then I did not catch the gentleman's idea.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I said that $6\frac{1}{2}$ cents was what we supposed we were paying for the average pound of mail, but in point of fact we were only paying $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents.

Mr. LLOYD. That included the sacks or pouches?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The last figure does include the payments for equipment. That is, we pay $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents for every pound transmitted, whether mail or equipment.

Mr. LLOYD. And the $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents does not include sacks, pouches, or anything else?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; it does.

Mr. OLMSTED. In the remarks just made by the gentleman from Massachusetts he seemed to speak of $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents as the rate per pound per mile. I understand that it is the rate for the entire distance.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I was speaking of the average rate paid all over the country, irrespective of the distance traveled.

Now, I must hurry on and consider the question whether we can safely and justly reduce the railway mail pay. And in discussing this question we must take into account that the fundamental idea is that of compensation. We have not any Government railroads, and the only way in which we can employ the roads is to pay them for what they do and pay them a fair price, which includes fair profit, and nothing more than that. Everyone agrees to that. Ordinarily we could ascertain this by finding out what is the cost of the service and adding to that a reasonable allowance for profit on the transaction. But for one I believe it is utterly impossible to ascertain separately the cost to the railroads of transporting the mails. I believe the nature of the business is such that it is utterly impossible to separate this business accurately from all the other business of the railroads and get even a just approximation of what the cost is, although I recognize fully the limitations of practical knowledge under which I speak. It may be thought possible that we can make inquiry as to the cost in other countries—

Mr. FINLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Would he consider it a fair compensation for carrying the mails if we should give the railroad companies the same average of compensation that they receive from the public for all other service?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Unquestionably, for the same service. If anything, the railroads ought to serve the Government a little cheaper than they serve anybody else.

Mr. FINLEY. Does the investigation in which the gentleman has taken part answer that question?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It deals with the question, though it may not answer it. I am coming to that very matter and I would be glad to have the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina while I discuss it.

Mr. THROPP. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts tell us whether the rates have been reduced from year to year during the past ten years?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I am coming to that very question.

I can see that under ordinary circumstances in settling a question of this kind we might go to other countries and find there standards of comparison. We sought to do that. We sent an official of the Post-Office Department to Canada—Mr. Bradley—an acute observer, and, I think, a profound thinker, with great knowledge upon this whole subject. Mr. LOUD went in behalf of the commission to Europe and investigated the service in Germany, France, and Great Britain. Reports upon both investigations are in the evidence. Those two reports I commend to the attention of gentlemen who care to study and understand this subject. I can not dwell upon them in my limited time. I can only say that so far as we could judge—and I think we can judge very little because the differences were so great—we are getting the mails carried as cheaply as any of the countries where we sought to make any observations.

Then we have the method of comparison just suggested by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY]—comparison with freight and express and passenger charges on the same railroads. It seemed to us after studying the question that the passenger service is probably the least profitable service to the railroads. In fact, it was claimed to be doubtful if this service was of any profit at all, and the least profitable part of the passenger service seemed to be that part of it which was performed in Pullman and other

parlor cars. This observation is of great weight when we come to consider the nature of railway mail transportation.

We considered the comparisons with express transportation. We found great difficulty in making such comparisons. Why? Because the large express company makes contracts with the railroad companies by which it gives a certain part of its gross receipts in full compensation for all services rendered—generally up to 40 and 50 per cent, and in some cases, I believe, even higher. In other words, the express company collects all its charges from the public and then turns in, say, 50 per cent of the gross amount in payment for transportation.

We found that the nature of the service rendered by the railroad to the express company and that rendered to the Government in the carriage of the mail differed very greatly indeed. The Government expects to receive very much more expensive service than the express company receives. We did find, however, one place where we could make an exact comparison. We found that the Illinois Central Railroad had a contract with the American Express Company by which the railroad company agreed to give to the express company certain parts of cars or whole cars upon specified trains, and the contract provided for payment for the space thus allotted to the express company. That contract will be found on page 421 of part I of our report. We submitted that contract to an expert in the Post-Office Department, and told him to tell us whether the Government or the express company was paying the most for the service received. He figured out the results and compared them. I am not mathematician enough to know whether the process was right, but nobody has criticised it.

In that case, at least, the express company was paying very much more—almost twice as much—for the same service as the Government was paying. The general question of the comparison of express and mail payments is best discussed in the report of Mr. Adams and the testimony of Mr. Julier, of the American Express Company.

But I can not tell—I do not think any man can—which character of business is the most profitable for the railroad company. If I had to guess, and guess upon my life, I would say that the express business was more profitable to the railroad than the mail business; and, again, I would say that the passenger business was less profitable, and that the most profitable business of all was that in which the charges are nominally the lowest—that is, the transportation of freight.

Mr. Chairman, I can not delay to make comparisons of the different classes of railroad business, even if I had the ability and knowledge necessary to do so. I am conscious that I have neither.

I can only say that, so far as I myself am concerned, the comparisons between the charges for the transportation of mail on the one hand and the transportation of passengers, express, and freight on the other hand have afforded me little aid. The difference in the conditions of transportation and the difficulty of translating those differences of conditions into dollars and cents are so great that I find it impossible to make the comparisons in any way which assists me. You will find these comparisons frequently made and discussed from all sides in the testimony of the witnesses who were before the commission. In addition to the report of Professor Adams and the testimony of Mr. Julier, to which I have already referred, these questions are thoroughly discussed by Mr. Finley Acker, Mr. Kruttschnitt, and Mr. Kenna.

I have, however, thought it of significance to bring before the House the comparative reductions since 1880 in mail, passenger, and freight transportation, and the relative growth of the three kinds of traffic, and shall proceed to do so. The value, however, of these statistics depends entirely upon the assumption that at the earlier period a just relation between the charges for mail, freight, and passengers existed, an assumption which it is difficult to prove or disprove. If we attempt to inquire into the relative justice of the rates at the earlier period, we simply remove the problem to a time where it is still more difficult of solution than at the present time. It may be said generally that the evidence before us showed that when the law of 1873 was enacted the railroads protested that the standard of compensation provided in the law was unjust to them.

Apparently the Government at that time conceded that to some extent the railroads were right in their complaints, because Mr. Bangs, then the Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service, expressed the opinion that the rate of pay for postal cars should be increased 50 per cent and the railroads relieved from the burden of delivering the mails to post-offices not more than 80 rods distant from the railway station. Congress, however, did not adopt Mr. Bangs' recommendations, and the law remained unaltered. Complaints of the railroads gradually ceased, possibly because they adjusted themselves to conditions, as men and corporations are apt to do when they find that they can not be changed.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. THROPP] asked a few moments ago if there had been any reduction in the rates paid

for mail transportation the last few years. Of course there has been no change in the standard of payment. The existing law has been in effect since 1878, and has not been modified, but the nature of the law is peculiar.

Mr. FINLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, with his consent, as to what further investigation is necessary to furnish the data necessary to arrive at a proper conclusion in connection with this matter?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I will come to that as I proceed. I am hastening as rapidly as possible with the brief time now at my disposal.

Mr. BROMWELL. Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts is about to expire, and this is probably one of the most important speeches we shall have on the subject from a gentleman thoroughly competent to talk upon it, and I wish to move that the gentleman be given all the time he wants to complete his remarks, so that he will not be hurried or cut off in anything that he desires to submit to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the House for its courtesy and will not abuse it, but will hasten on as rapidly as I can.

I was saying that there had been no change in the law since 1878. I have described the features of the law, which automatically reduce the rate of payment as the weight of the mail carried is increased. The result has been, I may say, a great reduction in the actual amount paid per hundred pounds for the transportation of the mails. For instance, it cost in 1873 to transport the mail per ton per mile 26.42 cents. It cost us in 1898 per ton per mile 12.567 cents. Both figures include postal-car compensation; so there has been a great reduction under the automatic operation of the law.

Mr. THROPP. Does the gentleman refer to the period from 1873 to 1898?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Yes; and since 1880, when the statistics first became available for comparison, there has been a decrease in passenger rates of 31 per cent, a decrease in mail rates of 39 per cent, always understanding that this is the automatic decrease of which I speak. The decrease in freight rates has amounted to 44 per cent. In other words, during that period mail rates have decreased considerably more than passenger rates and somewhat less than freight rates.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I am coming to just what I know the gentleman wants to ask.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I presume the gentleman is a mind reader? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. There is this fact, however, to be observed, which prevents the statement that I have just made from being a complete answer to the proposition of reduction. In the meantime—that is, since 1880—passenger mileage had increased 233 per cent. The ton mileage of freight had increased 353 per cent, and the ton mileage of mail had increased 579 per cent. In other words, mail had increased much more than passengers, much more than freight. That brings us to the real question in this case. Why is it that mail rates should not be reduced still further when we find that the increase of the ton mileage has been as great as the statistics show it to be and so much greater than the increase either in freight or passenger traffic.

Mr. THROPP. Will the gentleman allow me just one question on that same subject?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. In a moment. Let me answer the gentleman who interrupted me first.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. What I wanted to suggest was—and I know the gentleman desires to be perfectly fair in this matter—I wanted to ask him if it is not true that this difference between 26 cents and 12½ cents does not originate from these false weighings and false statistics with which the public were deceived?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. No, it does not have any connection with those weighings. That reduction is computed from the actual amounts paid to the railroads for transportation and the actual distance traveled. The weight of the mails that originate throughout the country is of no importance on the question of railway mail transportation, and you can not tell anything about railway mail transportation simply from the total weight of the mail. The weight of mail that is concerned in railway mail transportation is the weight carried upon each road. One piece of mail may be carried 10 miles, over a part of one road, or it may be carried 3,000 miles, over several roads. The weight of mails that is concerned in railway mail transportation is the weight carried upon each road. For the purposes of mail compensation, mail

may be weighed five or six times on five or six different roads in going across the country.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. What I had in mind was the statement which I understood the gentleman to make, that when this investigation began, the people had false statistics upon which to act.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. And they thought they were paying the railroad companies about 26 cents, when in reality, if they knew the real statistics, they were only paying about 12.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. No; these statistics that I have just given were furnished by Professor Adams. They show the true figure in both cases. They were never available to the public before. He has taken what we actually do now pay to the railroads and what we actually paid them in 1873. The difference is the true reduction in the rate per ton per mile. Now I will answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. THROPP. I only wish to make the matter perfectly clear. As I understand now, we have really reduced the rate per ton per mile within twenty-five years more than half—that is, from 26 cents and a fraction to 12 cents and a fraction.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. THROPP. In addition to that has not the Government received the benefit during these twenty-five years of greatly improved service in fast trains for carrying the mails?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Unquestionably.

Mr. THROPP. So that the Government has been benefited in both ways.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. In both ways, unquestionably. There can be no dispute about that. There is really not much dispute about the facts, although there may be disagreement about the proper inferences to be drawn from them.

I had just called attention to the fact of the almost equal reduction of mail and freight rates, and also to the fact that the ton mileage of mail had increased very much more than the increase observed in any other character of transportation, and I had put to myself the real question in the case, why under these circumstances should there not be a greater decrease in mail rates than has actually been observed under the operation of the law of 1873. When we get these statistics we are at once brought to that question, and the proper answer to that question is the proper determination of this controversy.

It is a law of transportation; I do not mean a statute law, but an economic law of transportation, upon which everybody seems to agree, that with the increase of traffic there should be a decrease of transportation cost per unit. Professor Adams states that. Every railroad man who was before us agreed to it. It commends itself to the common sense and intelligence of everyone who undertakes to study the question. But when we come to consider that law it depends upon a reason, and the reason is this: That with the increase of density of traffic greater economies are possible, and therefore there can be a decrease in the unit cost of the transportation of commodities. And if we find a place where the reason for that rule fails, we shall find a place where the rule itself fails. The railroads have told us again and again, "Let us transport the mail as merchandise and we shall be glad to transport it for a small fraction of what we now receive. We will transport it just as cheaply as we will transport the cheapest class of freight—soap, or sand, or sugar, or any other sort of heavy cheap freight. We will give you exactly the same rates if you will let us transport it in the same way."

The difficulty in applying the economic law under consideration to the postal service is just this. The requirements of the service deny to the railroads the economies upon which the workings of the law of transportation depends, and especially the economy of so transporting the load that the ratio of the dead weight hauled to the paying freight is a small one. One of the reasons for the great decrease in charges for freight transportation observed in this generation is that the ratio of the dead weight to the paying load has constantly decreased. According to the statistics of the Interstate Commerce Commission concerning all the railroads of the country, there is on the average a ton of paying freight to every ton and a third of dead load hauled. The cars are filled full, and there is no unnecessary dead weight hauled. When, however, we come to the postal service, the conditions are exactly reversed. The demand of the Government has been for heavier cars and for more space in them, to be used for distribution and not for carrying the mail.

The Post-Office Department voices the demand of the people for quick and frequent transportation of mails and their assortment while in the course of transportation. The people will not consent to allow the mails to accumulate. In responding to this demand the railroad companies are unable to load postal cars economically. We are in the condition of the man who is not content with a half seat in a car, but desires, with two or three companions, to have a whole car. In the one case he expects to pay one rate of fare. In the other he may justly be required to pay

another rate. We take the postal car and fill it with bags and racks and sacks and they all take room. Consider, for instance, the mail cars that run into Chicago. They go into Chicago with the mail assorted for the carrier for the business part of the city. They run into the city with 175 sacks into which the mail is distributed. That can not be done without room. If the Government, by the will of the people, insists on having the room in which to do this work, it must pay for it, and there is no escape from that conclusion.

I ought not to fail to notice that railroad companies are compelled to deliver the mails from the railway station to the post-office where the post-office is within 80 rods from the station. That is an item of considerable, though unascertained, magnitude. There is another thing: They are compelled, under moral duress at least, to transport the officials. They furnish transportation, for instance, from Washington to San Francisco to officials on their way to Manila.

A MEMBER. Post-office officials?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Certainly, post-office officials. The Postmaster-General sends to the railroad company and says: "I want transportation for Mr. Smith from Washington to San Francisco," and gets it. Possibly the railroad company is not obliged to give the transportation, but they do give it. It probably costs a million dollars a year. As the free rural delivery is extended the cost of this free transportation will undoubtedly increase.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLEMING] in his report recommends that this practice should be discontinued. I agree with him that in equity it ought to be discontinued, yet I am not quite willing to give up anything which we now have without obtaining some equivalent for it. I am afraid that the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia that we hereafter pay all car fares of the postal officials will prove an item of so great magnitude that it will go far to offset the reduction which his other suggestions would bring about. But to return. It is not probable that we shall ever be able to effect a change by which the distribution on the railway mail cars will cease. Indeed, I am not by any means prepared to say that such a change would be desirable or even practicable. Four or five years ago one of the Postmasters-General stated that it was the ultimate purpose of the Department to cause all distribution to be made upon the trains.

Undoubtedly that would expedite the mails, expedite them very much indeed; yet if that is done it will cost something. If we insist on expediting the mails in every possible manner, by pneumatic tube, by frequent deliveries, by the use of postal cars for distribution, in such a manner that only two or three tons of paying freight can be carried in them, we shall find that all those luxuries will prove to be expensive. If we are going to undertake to rival the telegraph and telephone in expedition, we must pay for it. As the House well knows, I have been conservative in the adoption of these devices for the further expedition of the mail.

I have been in favor of putting on the brakes lest we absolutely swamp the Post-Office Department with a deficit. It may be that some things that I have said will be considered as criticisms upon those in charge of the Post-Office Department. Sometimes I have thought that their minds were too intent upon expedition and splendid results and too heedless of the cost of them. Yet, if this criticism is at all well founded, it is a criticism upon Congress rather than upon the Department, for the Department can do nothing except what Congress approves and provides the money for. The American postal service is a branch of governmental activity of which the people may well be proud. It is characterized by the most efficient service possible and by faithful employees, devoted to its success.

Let me now say a few words upon the conclusions of the commission on the question of railway mail pay as expressed in the several reports. We have all agreed on one thing, and Professor Adams agrees with us. We have all agreed that there is no gross excess in the mail payments to the railroads. The theory that railroads have been grossly overpaid has been destroyed. No man can read the evidence or study the question in the light of the evidence unless he comes to that conclusion which the eight members of the commission and their expert have unanimously done. Yet there are some differences of opinion disclosed in the several reports. Four members of the commission—Senators WOLCOTT, ALLISON, and MARTIN, and Representative LOUD—agree in the recommendation that the railroads are not overpaid and that the law ought not to be changed, except that Mr. LOUD holds that there should be a radical change in the law by substituting payments on the space basis for those prescribed in the present law.

My own report is that while I am not ready to recommend affirmatively any reduction in the present rate, yet I think that further investigation should be made by a commission to be constituted differently from the Congressional commission, in the hope that more economical methods of transporting the mail may be discovered. In the absence of more definite information as to the present practice, I have been unable to join in a report which

shall consider the question as absolutely closed. In my report the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] concurs. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLEMING] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] agree in recommending a reduction which would amount, approximately, to \$3,000,000 a year. It will be seen from this statement that the difference between the members of the commission is not a great one.

Of the thirty-nine and a half million dollars which we shall pay the railroads next year for mail transportation, a reduction of three millions is not a great saving, though we ought to save every dollar we can. On the other hand, the loss of that \$3,000,000 is not a great loss to the railroads. The mail pay of all the railroads together in 1898 constituted only 2½ per cent of their total earnings. The gentleman from Georgia has said in his report, I doubt not with accuracy, that the reduction of \$3,000,000 proposed by him would be but one-twentieth of 1 per cent of the annual gross earnings. The question, therefore, is not vitally important either to the Government or to the railroads. Each desires exact justice. The railroads wish all that belongs to them, and the Government does not wish to pay a cent it ought not to pay.

I only speak of the narrowness of the issue between those who think there ought to be a reduction and those who are not satisfied that there ought to be a reduction, to show that gentlemen considering this question may come to opposite conclusions without violent differences of opinion. I am bound to say frankly that up to the Christmas holidays I had determined to report in favor of some reduction. I took all the testimony home with me, and without suggestion upon it from anyone, re-read thoroughly all the important parts of it, and came to the conclusion that I could not safely, with justice, in the present stage of the investigation, advocate any decrease.

I confess I was led to that conclusion more by a careful examination of Professor Adams' views than by any other matter contained in the evidence. Yet it is doubtless true that Professor Adams has suggested a reduction in pay, and I will say a very few words in regard to his suggestions. His proposition of reduction is twofold. First, he suggests a horizontal reduction upon all railway mail pay of 5 per cent. I can not follow him in that part of his opinion, because the reasons which he gives for it do not commend themselves to my best judgment. I can not quote extensively from his report on this part of the subject. In the original report no reasons were given for this horizontal reduction. In volume 2, page 445, he discusses the reasons for this suggestion in his revised examination. He says:

Justification of the horizontal reduction—that is to say, a reduction which affects all roads under all conditions and in all parts of the country—is found in the fact that the railways of the country during the last quarter of a century have been benefited by improved methods of manufacture and changes in the price of equipment and supplies quite independently of the economies introduced as the result of increased traffic.

Speaking further, he says:

I assumed that the purpose of this commission was to efface the deficit in the post-office administration. Possibly I took too seriously the statement of the chairman when (Part III of testimony, p. 76) he explained the reason for the existence of this commission as follows: "The country finds itself running an unprofitable Post-office Department. It desires to find a remedy for it." In reading the testimony presented, I find that the advocates of the railways objected to any reduction whatever, claiming that now they were underpaid, while many of the advocates of reduced pay desired not only to wipe out the deficit, but to reduce postage at the same time, and proposed to throw the entire burden of economy upon the railways. Now, I hold that the railways are overpaid, but they are not grossly overpaid, and it seemed to me fair to them that they should not be called upon to bear the entire burden of the economies necessary to wipe out the postal deficit. In viewing this entire matter, I came to the conclusion that \$3,000,000 was the limit that could reasonably be asked from railways and that the remainder of the saving necessary to wipe out the deficit should come from the economies in the postal administration itself.

Further on he says:

I am glad of the opportunity to make this explanation, because it shows that the recommendation of 5 per cent horizontal reduction in the railway mail pay rests upon the assumption that my report is but a part of a general scheme for reorganizing the Post-Office Department in order to extinguish the annual deficit.

In another part of his testimony he says that he has not examined the effect of a 5 per cent horizontal reduction on the smaller and more highly paid roads, a question which certainly ought to be investigated, because we found that upon those routes, in quite a number of cases, the railroad actually had expended more money for the messenger service from the station to the post-office than their total mail pay amounted to. I hope everyone will read all that Professor Adams says upon this subject. While it is true that he suggests that the general economies in railroad transportation introduced in recent years justify this reduction, I can not fail to think that his dominant thought was, in his closing words, that the commission was a scheme for extinguishing the annual deficit.

Now, I do not take that view of the question, and for that reason have not given much thought to the 5 per cent horizontal reduction.

Secondly, Professor Adams proposes the extension of the progres-

sive rate of reduction expressed in the existing law. Gentlemen will remember that under the law of 1873 the limit of specific reductions is reached when 5,000 pounds per day are carried over the whole length of the route. Beginning at this point he proposes a progressive reduction in pay of from 1 to 12 per cent, the 12 per cent reduction applying to the lowest paid, and therefore the routes upon which traffic is most dense. I may say in passing that it is not unlikely that the 5,000-pound point was originally fixed as the point where reduction should stop, because at that time it was the point where economy in transportation must stop. That has been true ever since. Two and a half tons is about an average postal car load, and no matter how much the mail may increase, if the cars can not be loaded any more heavily than that, there is no opportunity for increased economy dependent upon increase in the weight of mail.

I do not understand, after studying Professor Adams' report and testimony with all the care of which I am capable, that he recommends unconditionally a reduction of mail pay. He urgently suggests further investigation, both into the present method of loading the cars and into the question of whether present methods can not be changed without detriment to the service. Many times he expresses the view that if the statements which were contradicted before us with regard to the loading of the cars were true there ought not to be any reduction. He declines to accept them as true. He declines to accept them as inevitable if they are true. In both of these respects I agree with him. I think we stopped at the point where we ought to have begun again. I say "begun again" for the reason that I think that the studies of Professor Adams upon the subject so revolutionized our conceptions of it that they furnished a new point of departure for investigation. Nor am I content without further inquiry to acquiesce in the theory that the second, third, and fourth class mail should be transported under the same conditions of speed and expense which we demand for first-class mail.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Is the gentleman going to ask a further investigation of the subject?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I have done so in my report. If the gentleman will read it he will find that I suggested that it would not be wise to prolong the life of the present commission and that further inquiry can be best conducted by a commission differently constituted. Let me warn gentlemen never to allow themselves to be appointed upon a commission. If, as my trunk was packed to go to Massachusetts at the close of the session in 1898, when I heard my name read from the Speaker's desk as a member of this commission, I had known then what was coming, my resignation would have been the next thing that would have been heard.

Mr. BROMWELL. May I suggest that it is fortunate for the House and the country that the gentleman did not know it?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Ohio is very kind—more kind, I fear, than accurate in that respect. But let me return to the recommendation in my report. I recommended specifically a commission headed by Professor Adams. Confessedly he has no knowledge of the practical questions in the transportation of the mails. He stated himself many times that he had not the opportunity to study the practical side of the question as it ought to be studied. I am sure that he would agree with what I say. He is a man of great ability, and in the handling of a question of that kind the equal of any man in the country. It goes without saying that he is a man of the greatest sincerity and honesty. I believe that a commission headed by such a man as Professor Adams and reinforced by one of our best experts from the Post-Office Department—and we have many experts in that Department—and reinforced again by a fair-minded railroad man—and we saw splendid specimens of that kind of railroad man in the course of our investigation—I believe, I say, that such a commission could take up this question where we left it and bring about results which would be beneficial alike to the railroads and to the Government.

Whether my suggestion is adopted or not, I am confident that the work of the commission has not been without good results. The report of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General furnishes two instances of economies which are fairly traceable to the inquiry instituted by Congress, though the specific credit of these economies belongs to that gentleman himself. The disclosure which the new weighings made, that nearly half of what we paid to the railroads was on account of the weight of equipment, has led the Department to substitute for the lightest pouches we now have pouches which weigh about half as much. When this substitution is completed there must be a very considerable saving in the payments to railroads. Again, mail equipment and post-office supplies are now being transported in carload lots by the cheaper method of freight, and thus are withdrawn from the expensive system of mail transportation.

A few words more and I am done. I have already said that the reduction in rates proposed is not a large one. I think I am bound to give my opinion whether the railroads would acquiesce if we

should actually make this reduction. In my opinion, they would. They would think it unjust. I believe they would sincerely think it unjust, but I think they would still acquiesce in the reduction. Several reasons lead me to that opinion. The railroads are very anxious to carry the mails. They desire the business for one reason or another, not especially, I think, because it is profitable, but they desire it and will compete for it. Gentlemen may remember the marvelous competition that occurred very recently between the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy and the Chicago and Northwestern for the privilege of carrying the mails between Chicago and Omaha on the fast mail train. They say they are losing money upon that transportation. Very likely they are, but for some reason the carriage of the mail is thought to be a desirable thing for the railroads. They put on these splendid trains perhaps through the same motive which leads them to run trains with fine sleepers and parlor cars, not because it pays, but because it advertises the railroad and on the whole promotes its well-being.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. That is one of the "utilities."

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Yes; again the land-grant railroads under the law are transporting the mails for 80 per cent of what is paid to other railroads. They apparently do it willingly, though they render the same service which is rendered by other roads. They are glad to get the business. They compete for it. It pays regularly in good and bad times alike. Finally the railroads must carry the mails. It is the lifeblood of the communities through which they run. They are as much obliged to carry them as they are to carry coal and the other necessities of life. One gentleman representing the railroads before us said frankly, "We have to carry the mails even if you compel us to carry them for nothing."

Though I state freely to the House my opinion that the railroads would acquiesce in the reduction proposed by this amendment, I think we ought to be governed by higher considerations than that. I think we should be governed by considerations of justice and equity. I think I might call the House to witness that I have never been in my service here the special advocate or creature of any corporation or corporations. I have endeavored to settle all questions upon the merits as they appeared to my understanding. We should let nothing escape which justly belongs to us, but in dealing with the railroads of the country we are bound to observe the same high standard of justice which we have the right to exact from them in return. [Loud applause.]

Preservation of Niagara Falls and the Level of the Waters of the Great Lakes.

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 16, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The substitute for section 4 of this bill, which has been accepted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], in my opinion is not second in importance to any provision of this measure. The substitute is taken from Senate resolution 71, which has been passed unanimously by the Senate and is now before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House. The substitute reads as follows:

SEC. 4. That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to invite the Government of Great Britain to join in the formation of an international commission, to be composed of three members from each country, whose duty it shall be from time to time to report upon the conditions and uses of the waters adjacent to the boundary line between the United States and Canada, including all the waters of the lakes and rivers whose waters flow by the river St. Lawrence to the Atlantic Ocean, also upon the maintenance and regulation of suitable levels, and also upon the effect upon the shores of these waters and the structures thereon, and upon the interests of navigation by reason of their diversion from their natural flow; and, further, to report upon the necessary measures to regulate such diversions; and, further, to enter into such agreements and make such recommendations for improvements as shall best subserve the interests of navigation in said waters.

The President is authorized to appoint the United States members of such commission, and said commission is authorized to employ such surveyors, experts, and other persons as it may deem needful in the performance of the duties hereby imposed.

And for the purposes of said commission the Secretary of War is authorized to expend, from the amounts heretofore appropriated for securing a 20-foot channel in the connecting waters of the Great Lakes between Buffalo

and Duluth and Chicago, the sum of \$20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the portion of the expenses of said commission chargeable to the United States, including compensation for said commissioners representing the United States, and of surveyors, experts, and other necessary services.

Now, Mr. Chairman, without burdening the committee with statistics that have been so widely published, it suffices to say that the volume and extent of the commerce and of transportation interests that are involved with these waters are enormous and rapidly increasing.

Any serious diminution of the navigable features of these waters would result in incalculable losses and concern world-wide interests.

The numerous projects for utilizing these waters for navigation, transportation, and for varied industrial operations, which look to their diversion from their natural flow, are now a menace to vast interests, and some such authoritative examination should without delay be set afoot as will present the facts in authentic form for definite action on the part of the nations primarily concerned.

The committee will bear in mind that the substitute simply proposes an inquiry into the subjects involved and a report thereon as the basis of such action as Congress may deem advisable.

The commission, it is hoped, will be constituted of those able to deal intelligently and disinterestedly with the subjects involved in their varied relations.

I will enumerate a few of the projects that are already more or less advanced that will have a bearing on the integrity and usefulness of these waters.

The Chicago Drainage Canal is taking of the water that would naturally flow by Niagara Falls through the St. Lawrence to tide water 300,000 cubic feet per minute. This diversion it is proposed to extend to the Mississippi River, thence to the Gulf, to facilitate the commerce of the Mississippi Basin.

From the Chicago Tribune of Tuesday, December 25, 1900, I learned that the flow of water through the Chicago River and the drainage canal was increased from 250,000 to 300,000 cubic feet a minute, December 24, 1900. On that day, for the first time, the full legal flow was turned on, and within a few moments the current in the river had increased until the water ran 4 miles an hour at the narrow points along the channel. Vessel men assert that this speed will be disastrous to shipping, and contend that had navigation not closed some time previous for the winter much trouble would have been caused to marine interests. As it was, complaint was made by Armour & Co. that the increased flow had lowered the water in the South Branch so that the company had been forced to close down its glue plant. No complaints of danger to property were received, though they were expected.

President Jones is reported to have asserted that the full flow would continue unless the War Department interfered or threatening danger to property or shipping demanded the lowering of the bear-trap dam and the reduction of the flow. He contended, it is said, that the increased quantity of water would aid in bettering health conditions in Chicago.

The law requires—

Said he—

that a flow of 300,000 cubic feet a minute shall be maintained. Consequently, the board has no choice in the matter, and this flow will continue indefinitely. Had navigation not been closed we doubtless would have received many complaints. The increased flow will continue next spring, however, unless it is shown that shipping interests will meet disaster if the volume of water is not lessened.

Another canal is proposed from Cleveland to the Ohio River. A ship waterway is projected from the Georgian Bay to the Ottawa River, thence to Montreal, where immense expenditures are now being made to facilitate carriage to tide water through Canadian territory, shortening the distance of the water route to the extent of about 400 miles.

The enlargement of the Erie Canal is proposed at an expenditure on the part of the State of New York of something over sixty millions.

It must readily be seen that a very slight diminution of the depth of these waters will most disastrously affect structures on their margins at the lake shipping ports, such as docks, bulkheads, warehouses, and elevators, and render useless or of diminished utility a large volume of lake vessels.

The State of New York has granted most improvidently and unwisely rights to take of the waters of the Niagara River in immense quantities, in some cases unlimited, without the payment of one dollar of compensation to that State.

These waters are to be diverted from their flow over Niagara Falls, carried round by means of canals, and debouch below the falls.

Two favored beneficiaries are now taking water from the river in large quantities, and the Canadian government is granting similar privileges, but with provident provisions for compensation.

I know of seven separate and distinct companies which have been granted the right to take these waters. The companies are:

The Niagara Falls Hydraulic Power and Manufacturing Company, organized in 1879 under the manufacturing act of 1848, but without special rights of a charter from the State. This company owned a canal 70 feet wide and 14 feet deep, tapping the river 1 mile above the falls, with a horsepower capacity of 8,000 and a water flow of 1,727,880 gallons a minute. I understand it has or will double the size of the canal, which, of course, means nearly doubling the amount of water it will take. The State of New York receives no compensation from this company.

The Niagara River Hydraulic Tunnel, Power and Sawyer Company of Niagara Falls was chartered in 1886, and changed its name in 1889 to the Niagara Falls Company. This company is prohibited from taking more water from the river than shall be sufficient to produce 200,000 effective horsepower. Its horsepower capacity at present is believed to be 100,000, and it draws from the river to generate this amount 3,859,680 gallons a minute.

If its tunnel were increased so as to carry water enough to generate the permitted 200,000 horsepower, about 6 per cent of the total amount of water flowing over the falls would be diverted by this company alone, as various experts have agreed in their computations that the total flow is about 123,420,000 gallons a minute. For this right, to which many others were added by the State to facilitate the sale of the company's power and light, the company pays nothing. Canada was much shrewder in this respect than New York. The same company obtained from the Dominion Government a grant for the use of an equal amount of water on the Canadian side of the river, and for this it pays a fixed rental of \$15,000 for the first 10,000 electrical horsepower generated and an additional charge for every horsepower disposed of beyond the first 10,000. In 1899 the company paid to the commissioners of the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park \$20,000.

The Lockport Water and Electric Company, chartered in 1886; the Niagara County Irrigation and Water Supply Company, chartered in 1891; the Lewiston Water Supply Company, incorporated in 1888; the Model Town Company, incorporated in 1893; the Niagara, Lockport and Ontario Power Company, incorporated in 1894; and the Buffalo and Niagara Power and Drainage Company, incorporated in 1889, all have authority to use an unlimited supply of water without paying the State of New York a cent for it.

The end is not yet, as will appear from the following article taken from the New York Sun of December 4, 1900:

RIVAL OF NIAGARA POWER COMPANY—THE VANDERBILTS SAID TO BE INTERESTED IN A SCHEME TO BUILD A GREAT POWER PLANT.

LOCKPORT, N. Y., December 3.

The Vanderbilt millions, through the agency of the Niagara, Lockport and Ontario Power Company, will build a great power plant, rivaling in extent the famous Niagara Falls plant, will construct a big water conduit from Lake Ontario to Lockport to supply this city with water, cut a wide power canal from Niagara River to this city, build a power-transmission line to Depew, and make of Lockport and Depew electric cities. The common council and a mass meeting of citizens are to-night discussing the propositions of this company and the Lockport and Newfane Water Supply Company to give this city a water supply from Lake Ontario, 12 miles distant.

The Lockport and Newfane Company is backed by the International Traction Company, and is making a fight for the water contract. The first-mentioned company holds the franchise for a power canal, and, contending that it has enlisted the support of the New York millionaires, has given the city to understand that if it makes a water contract with it the company will build the great canal. It stands ready to buy the right of way, which will cost \$1,000,000, build the conduit from Lake Ontario, which will cost another million, and construct the power canal from Niagara River, which will cost \$8,000,000. The correspondent for the Sun has good authority for the statement that the Vanderbilt millions are behind this company and that the electric power generated here will be supplied to the Central shops and other factories at Depew. The city will probably accept the Vanderbilt company's offer.

Mr. Chairman, no one at all conversant with the subject can doubt that the Falls of Niagara are too seriously impaired in their grandeur by these diversions, and that this spectacle, unique on this planet, will be shorn of its sublimity.

The mere utilitarian features of this subject do not concern the State of New York alone, but of the United States, at least seven States.

About twenty years ago proceedings were held in New York City to forward a movement to preserve for the people the grand spectacle of the Falls of Niagara. The measure readily commanded the sympathy of intelligent persons on both sides of the Atlantic, and prominent among them were those of high scientific and literary reputation. The State of New York acquired a considerable area along the shore of the Niagara River, including the islands and the bed of the river to the international line. Up to this time, with its improvements, it has cost that State nearly \$3,000,000, and it is maintained at an annual moderate outlay of about \$30,000. It is annually visited by half a million persons from all parts of the globe.

The people of the city of New York paid for fully one-half of the cost of the property, and still pay more than one-half the cost of its improvements and maintenance. So that it must be borne in mind constantly that all parts of the State of New York are equally interested in the preservation of the falls, and the reserva-

tion should not be turned over to be administered solely by or for the benefit of those of the immediate vicinity, who paid but a fraction of the expense of its acquisition.

Strangely enough, the legislature of New York State, after purchasing the property, proceeded to grant the rights in it that are not unlikely to work the destruction of Niagara Falls. As already stated, no less than eight corporations have, or claim to have, acquired rights to use the waters of the river for manufacturing purposes, most of them to an extent without limit; two of them, however, are limited to 200,000 horsepower.

The value of 1 horsepower is, stating it moderately, \$5 per annum. Thus it will be seen that one of these companies derives from the State of New York a value of \$1,000,000 per annum without paying a copper for it, and the very same company acquires a right to 250,000 horsepower on the Canadian side upon the annual payment of a large sum of money. As properly might the gentlemen who are enjoying this immense donation from New York State get 10,000 or 20,000 acres of land of the State in the Adirondacks for nothing. If these gentlemen get the water from the river, which is of such value, they should pay for it as they do in Canada; but they should not get it at all if the falls are to be threatened with ruin, and I ask should a diversion of these waters be allowed at all? Should this stupendous manifestation of natural sublimity, unique on this planet, be effaced in order that a small part of the community may fill their pockets? There can be but one answer: No; three times no.

Mr. Chairman, this subject was up in the last constitutional convention of the State of New York, and upon a well-considered report it was recommended that the legislature be forbidden to grant rights to take these waters except for domestic or fire purposes. But the representatives of the factories interested prevented the passage of the wholesome recommendations of the committee, and destruction still holds the helm at Niagara.

It is answered by the beneficiaries that their factories contribute to tax values and give employment to labor, making no mention of the fact that the half million visitors per annum at the Falls contribute to railroads, to hotels and shops vastly more than all the increase of taxes caused by their manufactories.

The questions are: First, should these grants of valuable water power be made at all?

Second, if made, is it more than just that they be paid for as other property of the State is paid for?

This subject can not be satisfactorily dealt with by the State, judging from past experience, and therefore it is apparent that both the British Government and the United States should unite in a thorough examination of the questions involved in the diversion of the waters of the Great Lakes by an international commission to inquire into and report upon the whole subject. And this is the purpose of the proposed amendment to the bill.

I have very little personal knowledge of this subject. The data which I have used and am using have been furnished to me by one whose public spirit and disinterestedness are too well known to be challenged—Hon. Andrew H. Green, of New York. For seventeen years Mr. Green, than whom none is more entitled to be hailed as New York City's first citizen, and his collaborators on the commission in charge of the New York State reservation at Niagara have been working to preserve Niagara Falls to the State and the nation. In some measure they have succeeded, but the fight is not yet won. Commercial enterprise has always been in opposition to their views. It is ever seeking to harness the tremendous hydraulic power of the Niagara River for manufacturing purposes. It has lessened the volume of water plunging over the great ledges on both the American and the Canadian side, and has gained, as already set forth, such privileges from the government of the State of New York that if they were exercised to their fullest extent the probability of the ruin of the falls would seem to be the consequence.

Mr. Chairman, to those who have not given careful attention and deep study to this matter it may seem an exaggeration to say that the great volume of water now pouring over the Falls of Niagara can be appreciably diminished by the schemes of men. It is perhaps true that up to the present no diminution has been observed, but in these days of great things such a feat would be by no means wonderful. A beginning of this use of Niagara's waters has just been made, but the projects in contemplation and already authorized by the State of New York are so comprehensive in their scope and so alluring financially in prospect that, unless protective measures are taken, the danger will be a present one before long.

The adoption of the substitute will pave the way to a due inquiry. If there be no danger threatened, the commission will find it out and no harm will come. If there is danger, we should guard against it, for unto us has fallen the duty of protecting the immense interests involved in the preservation of the waters of the Great Lakes in all their fullness and freedom, and of preserving Niagara, the most unique natural wonder in the world, to generations of men to come. [Applause.]

The Late Cushman K. Davis.

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. GAMBLE,
OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Saturday, February 2, 1901.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:
"Resolved, That it is with deep regret and profound sorrow that the House of Representatives hears the announcement of the death of Hon. CUSHMAN KELLOGG DAVIS, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota.
"Resolved, That the House extends to his family and to the people of the State of Minnesota sincere condolence in their bereavement.
"Resolved, That, as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the business of the House be now suspended, to enable his associates to pay fitting tribute to his high character and distinguished services.
"Resolved, That the Clerk transmit to the family of the deceased and to the governor of the State of Minnesota a copy of these resolutions, with the action of the House thereon.
"Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.
"Resolved, That as an additional mark of respect, at the conclusion of these exercises, the House do adjourn."

Mr. GAMBLE said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I feel I could not do less than at least add my presence on this occasion as a partial expression of my grief at the great loss to the nation in the death of the distinguished citizen of Minnesota. The notification to me was so recent, and my time has been so completely occupied since my return to the city, I have had no opportunity whatever to put in form the words I would be glad to express. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, what I have to say will be brief. My admiration for Senator DAVIS was most high, and the people of my State had great appreciation of his splendid abilities and eminent statesmanship.

Aside from my personal regard for the deceased, especial reasons impel me to join with my colleagues in this memorial service. I recall a similar occasion some years since in the Senate. My brother, John R., was elected to the Fifty-second Congress. He died in the autumn of 1891, before taking his seat in this body. Among the eulogies pronounced on that occasion in his memory in the Senate none was more beautiful than that of Senator DAVIS. He spoke generous words concerning a noble and loving brother then. Can I now do less than drop a tear by the new-made grave of this noble and luminous spirit, and speak a kind word in his memory?

In addition to this, I can truthfully say the people of South Dakota greatly admired and loved CUSHMAN K. DAVIS. They felt under special obligations to him. Years ago the people of the then Territory long struggled for recognition and to be admitted as a State into the Federal Union. We felt we were denied rights justly due us and guaranteed under the Federal Constitution. Every effort was made by our people with the greatest earnestness and persistency, but Congress resisted every appeal and stood with deaf ear to our entreaties. We felt we complied with all the conditions to entitle us to statehood. Upon partisan grounds for long years we were denied either consideration or recognition.

At that time Senator DAVIS rendered us conspicuous service. He appreciated the aspirations of our people, and with his strong sense of justice came to our assistance. From the vantage ground of his position in the Senate he was most potential in promoting the cause of admission. He made one of the strongest arguments in our behalf when the matter was pending before that body.

We appreciated and loved him then. We admired him throughout his public life for his scholarship, his ability, his high purposes, and his patriotism. Great, noble, splendid soul, though of Minnesota, he belonged to the Northwest, and inspired it with his leadership, and he unstintingly had its admiration. Although the Northwest might claim him, his great talents or his fame could not be circumscribed. He belonged to the whole country, and his noble and generous manhood made him an ideal citizen of the Republic.

His life is a splendid study. Many beautiful and ennobling lessons have been drawn from it in our hearing here to-day. It is, and will be, an inspiration to the American youth. It gives substantial evidence of what may be accomplished in the highest sense under the rule of a republic. His aims were high, his purposes far-reaching, and with patience and industry he was willing to labor and to study, knowing in time the rich treasures he was gathering would serve him well in the years to come.

He did not mean that his life should be narrow. His studies were broad and his experiences comprehensive. His earlier and later training well fitted him for the extensive range and application of his high qualities and abilities. From the nature of his training he was fully equipped for every duty he was called upon to perform. His life was a natural and orderly development through all its stages: A resolute and tireless youth; a patient

and splendid student; a patriotic and noble young man, who offered his life as a sacrifice, if need be, to the integrity of his country; a wise and helpful citizen; a keen, well-equipped, and learned lawyer; a scholar, rich in the knowledge and experience of the world; a great executive of his adopted State; a legislator of conspicuous ability; a diplomat whose fame was not circumscribed by the limits of the Republic!

His services to his country were great. The people had unusual faith in his judgment. He was a patriot always, and had unbounded confidence in the destiny of the Republic. At no time in his public career did his wise counsel and splendid statesmanship seem so essential to his country as at the time of his decease.

He was easily a leader among the great men of the nation in helping to solve the momentous questions that came as a result of the recent war. The country looked to him as to none other in the Senate as being the real leader in their solution. By his researches, his learning, and high order of talents he was best equipped for that purpose. His statesmanship had been most potential in shaping our policy so far toward our new possessions. Had his life been spared he would have been in position to have rendered most conspicuous service in solving our definite and permanent relations with these new and distant peoples.

He had no misgivings for the future. He believed we had been led by a higher instinct and that the richness of the Orient was to be ours, not only for our civilization and our munificent influences in government, but for the wealth of our commerce, the glory of our people, and to assert, where we rightfully should, our highest and plainest duty to the world and to ourselves.

CUSHMAN K. DAVIS will always be a conspicuous figure in a great epoch in our country's history. He led us, as I believe no other statesman led us, into the great pathway of our future destiny. And in his exalted position, in the very zenith of his power and of his usefulness and service to his country he loved so well, his light went out.

Death takes us unawares,
And stays our hurrying feet.
The great design unfinished lies,
Our lives are incomplete.

His life was well rounded, replete with unusual service, complete, however much we had hoped for his future. In the midst of his activity, his wealth of learning and his power, how much more pathetic and noble his death. Resolute, strong, wonderfully equipped, he was at the very forefront in statesmanship in his own land, and held high place in the estimation of Europe. He died in the service of his country and in the midst of his activities.

Mr. Speaker, how grateful we should be for such a life, such a noble inspiration to the youth of this great Republic, inspiring to them, helpful to us. He was a leader who had sublime faith in the nation's destiny. He pointed to the pathway which leads to the nobler and higher civilization in the world's work of the future, in which he believed this Republic was to take a conspicuous part.

We speak of him as a student, a scholar, a soldier, a patriot, a statesman, and a diplomat. Well may we honor the life, the character, and the memory of CUSHMAN K. DAVIS.

The Late Hon. William D. Daly.

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. GARDNER,
OF NEW JERSEY,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Saturday, February 9, 1901.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:
"Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM D. DALY, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey.
"Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for fitting tribute to his memory.
"Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate, and transmit a copy of the same to the family of the deceased.
"Resolved, That as an additional mark of respect the House, at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings, do adjourn."

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Again we are called to pay the last sad tribute of respect to the memory of one who has fallen from our ranks, and again we have the solemn reminder of the incompleteness of human life and the futility of human ambition; that the work left unfinished, the lofty hopes unrealized, and the aspirations for the unachieved cast around the most peaceful close the elements of wreck and tragedy, and that nothing shall compensate but earnest devotion to the duties we owe to our Creator, our country, and our kind.

Mr. DALY had been many years in public life in New Jersey and was widely known. Perhaps no man enjoyed a personal acquaintance with more people of the State, as none was ever more ready to serve them on any and all occasions when his assistance was solicited, and hence, in part, it was that he was held in so general esteem that the news of his unexpected departure carried to a great portion of the people the shock of personal bereavement.

Mr. DALY came from the senate of his State, after a long term of service, to this House, where he would doubtless have been long kept by his constituents had not the cold hand of death thwarted their desires. His membership in this numerous House was too brief for the acquaintance necessary for the full appreciation of a member, but perhaps few men in so short a period made more friends or a wider circle of acquaintance. Had he been spared, he would have taken position here commensurate with his merits, of which time had not yet afforded the opportunity for a full recognition.

He was eminently social and kindly disposed, always affable and always pleasing; even in controversy he was courteous and free from any exhibition of temper, and in the most heated debate, or after it, never gave the slightest evidence of personal feeling, and hence he never wounded the feelings of an adversary.

*His wit in the combat, as gentle as light,
Ne'er carried a heartstain away on its blade.*

Mr. DALY was an intensely active man in his profession and in politics. Much of his activity was the result of that good nature which prompted him to readily respond to almost any call of his fellow-citizens; and while his generous, genial nature, and pleasing address made his presence and services especially desirable, his willing kindness emboldened desire to almost demand. Many of his fellow-citizens seemed to consider his services a sort of common property, and this notion he never appeared disposed to controvert.

As a speaker Mr. DALY was pleasing as well as gifted, always speaking with fluency and ease, possessed of a strong and pleasant voice and a fine presence. Besides, he strove to maintain his positions by logical deductions fortified by reputable authorities, and was a formidable opponent in the arena of politics or forum of law.

His death came to us with the added shock which suddenness gives to the loss of friends and those we esteem. We are accustomed to think of the pall of grief as lying the more heavy when suddenly cast upon us; but after all, the saddest way of dissolution may be when it comes only after disease and pain have banished hope and the utter futility of further aspiration is realized, when only the body and spirit remain together, and life longs to be released from pain and the soul from its prison.

He went out as the ship that sinks from the unseen cause. Ah, well, every life ends an unfinished voyage. The destination marked on the chart of the voyager is never reached. However golden and beautiful the ports in which he halts and anchors; whatever his achievements; however great his riches or wide his fame, his bark at last, whether blown upon the charted rocks, or sunk upon the unknown reef, or moored in some calm harbor there to fall to decay, ends its journey with the most coveted ports still far away on the distant horizon, which has but widened with the advance of the navigator.

Oleomargarine Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES L. BARTLETT,
OF GEORGIA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 7, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 3717) to make oleomargarine and other imitation dairy products subject to the laws of the State or Territory into which they are transported, and to change the tax on oleomargarine—

Mr. BARTLETT said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The objections to this measure are, to my mind, insurmountable. The first section proposes to accomplish by enactment into law that which is already the law. Under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, construing the State laws which have been passed for the purpose of preventing the sale of oleomargarine as butter, the States now have the power to protect

their citizens from impositions in the sale of oleomargarine as butter in the various States.

The chief purpose claimed by the advocates of this measure is to protect health and to prevent fraud in the sale of oleomargarine, and that the States have not the power to do so.

This contention can not be sustained. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Powell vs. Pennsylvania* (127 U. S. Rep., 978), decided that the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution was not designed to interfere with the exercise of the police power of the State for the protection of health and the prevention of fraud and the preservation of the public morals.

In this case the Supreme Court held that the prohibition of the manufacture of oleaginous substances, or out of any compound thereof other than that produced from unadulterated milk or cream from unadulterated milk, of any article designed to take the place of butter or cheese produced from pure unadulterated milk or cream from unadulterated milk; or the prohibition upon the manufacture of any imitation or adulterated butter or cheese, or upon the selling or offering for sale, or having in possession with intent to sell the same as an article of food is a lawful exercise by the State of the power to protect, by police regulations, the public health.

The court further held that whether the manufacture of oleomargarine or imitation butter of the kind described in the act of the legislature of Pennsylvania of May 21, 1885 (Laws of Penn., p. 22, No. 25), is or may be conducted in such a way or with such skill and secrecy as to baffle ordinary inspection, or whether it involves such danger to the public health as to require for the protection of the people the entire suppression of the business rather than its regulation in such manner as to permit the manufacture and sale of articles of that class that do not contain noxious ingredients, are questions of fact and of public policy which belong to the legislative department to determine.

The statute of Pennsylvania of May 21, 1885, "for the protection of the public health and to prevent adulteration of dairy products and fraud in the sale thereof," neither denies to persons within the jurisdiction of the State the equal protection of the laws nor deprives persons of their property without that compensation required by law, and is not repugnant in these respects to the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

That case brought for review before the Supreme Court of the United States the validity of the statute of Pennsylvania relative to the manufacture and sale of what is known as oleomargarine butter, and the Supreme Court upheld the validity of that statute and the conviction had thereunder.

In *Plumley vs. Massachusetts* (155 U. S. Rep., 461) the court held that the statute of Massachusetts, known as the statute to prevent deception in the manufacture and sale of imitation butter, and which provided a penalty for the sale of oleomargarine artificially colored so as to cause it to look like yellow butter, and which was brought into the State of Massachusetts, was not in conflict with the clause of the Constitution of the United States investing Congress with the power to regulate commerce among the several States.

In this case they restrained the application of the case of *Lacey vs. Hardin* (135 U. S. Rep., 100), and say that that case did not justify the broad contention that the State is powerless to prevent the sale of articles of food manufactured in or brought from another State, and subjects of traffic or commerce, if their sale may cheat the people into purchasing something they do not intend to buy, and which is wholly different from what its condition and appearance import.

And the Supreme Court laid down the proposition in that case that the judiciary of the United States should not strike down the legislative enactment of a State, especially if it has direct connection with the social order, the health, and the morals of its people, unless such legislation plainly and palpably violates some right granted or secured by the National Constitution or encroaches upon the authority delegated to the United States for the attainment of objects of national concern.

And in that case, referring to the previous act of Congress in 1886, which related to the sale of oleomargarine, the court say that that act of Congress was not intended as a regulation of commerce among the States, and that that act was not an assertion by Congress of the right to solely control or prescribe rules under which oleomargarine might be sold, and that any act Congress might pass in reference to such subject did not and could not interfere with the exercise by the States of any authority they possessed for preventing deception or fraud in the sales of property within their respective limits.

This was a case in which it was distinctly held that the law of the State of Massachusetts which prevents the sale of oleomargarine, whether manufactured in the State of Massachusetts or brought therein, which might be colored so as to cause it to look like yellow butter, was constitutional and could be enforced.

From a consideration of these decisions I believe it to be plain and evident that it is not necessary to pass this law, at least the first section of it, in order to have the laws of the various States enforced.

With reference to the second section, I am opposed to any law which discriminates in favor of any industry against another by taxation, and any policy which proposes to use the power of the Government to tax to destroy property or property rights.

Postal Telegraph and Telephone.

If there is to be a future of Democracy it can only come through the organization dominated by those Democrats who believe something, and not by those would-be "reorganizers" who merely want something.

A democratic Democrat is a man seeking an opportunity to do something for everybody. A degenerate Democrat is a man seeking an opportunity to do everybody for something.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. LENTZ,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 20, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 14236) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes—

Mr. LENTZ said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I move to amend by striking out the last word. I would like to know from the chairman of the committee in what connection this telephone service is necessary and where it is used?

Mr. CANNON. In the fire department, in the police department, in ordinary service, as will occur to the gentleman.

Mr. LENTZ. In connection with the fire department of the District of Columbia?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; and the police department.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that it seems to me that the time has come when we ought to appropriate, not merely a few hundred dollars, but ten, or fifteen, or twenty-five or more million dollars for telephone and telegraph equipment; that we ought to begin now to connect up this telephone and telegraph service with the Post-Office Department; that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people ought to know enough to avail itself of the institutions which it itself established when it made the appropriation to enable the Morse telegraph experiments to be made between this city and Baltimore.

If Professor Ely is right when he says that we could send telegrams across this country for 5 cents for a message of 10 words, and if others are correct who figure that we could send messages of 50 words throughout this country for 10 cents, instead of 10 words for an average of 50 cents, it seems to me that it is high time that the American Congress becomes intelligent enough to avail itself of the system, or to give the 77,000,000 people in this country the opportunity of carrying on business by electricity instead of waiting for locomotives and postal cars. Instead of a man in Chicago being four or five days in closing a business transaction in New York, he ought to be able to close it the same forenoon in which he opens it. We could just as well have this telephone and telegraph system extended across the continent as not. We could begin now extending this system by small appropriations from Washington in every direction as rapidly as the people along the various lines throughout the country consider it desirable and procure for the Government the right of way free of charge.

I say that the figures demonstrate—Professor Rolands, of Johns Hopkins, has demonstrated, as I understand, that you could send 3,000 words a minute by the latest instruments used for telegraphing. Why should not this Government have the benefit of the rate? Why should not these 77,000,000 people take now upon themselves the business of increasing the postal facilities by adding to them and making a telegraph and telephone system a part of the post-office system, connecting every township and every post-office in the most remote school district of the Union with this Capitol here at Washington? If the telegraphic facilities have been improved, as Professor Rolands says, so that you can send 3,000 words in a minute, there is no reason why a two-column news article should not go from Washington to every city in the Union in one minute every night, and the wires then be open for the benefit of the people at the nominal rate that would be necessary to carry on this business under such an extension of this system, thereby availing ourselves of the experience and the wisdom of European governments.

It does not seem to me that we are as wise as we boast ourselves. We are in the habit of talking about our great wisdom, and yet you can do these things in England and in Germany, but here a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, having gone down into its own Treasury fifty years ago to promote, establish, and equip a telegraphic system, has to farm it out to a monopoly, so that now you are paying five or ten times as much as is necessary; in fact, you are keeping the people apart. If there ever was any good reason for the establishment of the postal system founded by Franklin, there are reasons a hundredfold stronger now for the Government beginning the business of a postal telegraph and a postal telephone.

The people need it, and the Government needs it. We need it more than we need the Philippine Islands. We need it more than we need to make ourselves a world power. We need it more than we need glory. If we would use our resources, our intelligence, and our inventive ingenuity to bring into every post-office a telegraphic instrument and a telephone, we would be demonstrating that we are a people capable of self-government; but unless we proceed immediately and rapidly to the development of this system far beyond the use of it merely for the fire department and the police department, it is an evidence of decay instead of growth and progress in the United States. In this connection I desire to submit some remarks made by me before the Maryland Democratic Association at their banquet at the Eutaw House, Baltimore, on the evening of the 21st of February, celebrating Washington's Birthday. My conception of true or democratic Democracy is synonymous with true Americanism, and in substance I spoke as follows:

GENTLEMEN OF THE MARYLAND DEMOCRATIC ASSOCIATION: When the smoke of battle had cleared away last November, it was quite apparent to every student of civil government that Democracy had been defeated because of an unholy alliance between a callous commercialism and a barbarous lust for world power. Impoverished voters had been corrupted by bribery, and ignorant voters had been confounded by falsehood. Our Government, founded upon the equality of Jefferson, strengthened by the honesty of Jackson, and purified by the liberty of Lincoln was at last dominated by venality and cupidity. The house that Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln had built was at last appropriated to store the stolen goods of trust and tariff thievery.

In the last campaign, brains burdened with brutal bigotry, hearts hardened with hellish hate, pockets plethoric with public plunder, souls saturated with stupid superstition, all conspired to dethrone reason and right, to enthrone greed and might, to dishonor and destroy the Republic, and to evolve and establish an empire.

How long will it be before patriotic Americans realize that criminal partizanship means national suicide? Washington made war and revolution against the greed of the inherited aristocracy and the titled imbecility of 1776. Must we leave it for the next generation to make war against an inherited trustocracy and titled imbecility, or shall we here and now pledge and enlist ourselves, not for a hundred days, but to the end of the war, in behalf of that democratic Democracy of Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln which believes something, rather than that degenerate Democracy which merely wants something. If there is to be a future of Democracy, it can only come through the organization dominated by those Democrats who believe something, and not by those would-be reorganizers who merely want something.

You have assigned me, as a toast, "The Future of Democracy" for this evening's consideration and discussion. Definitions of the word "Democracy" would be in order, but I abbreviate all that by saying that, in my mind, the word "Democracy" means the doctrine of "the greatest good to the greatest number." The word "Democracy" means that "an injury to the least of us should be the concern of all of us." The word "Democracy" was best described by the Nazarene Teacher in His life work and companionship with fishermen, publicans, and sinners, the sick, the halt, and the blind, as well as by His words, when he said, "Love your neighbor as you love yourself." The word "Democracy" was well described by Abraham Lincoln as "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people." The true spirit of Democracy was again described by Lincoln when he said, "This country with its institutions belongs to the people who inhabit it."

But that Democratic hero and exemplar of American courage and honesty, Andrew Jackson, gave us a complete and comprehensive definition of the true meaning of the word and purpose of Democracy when he said, "Labor in peace is the source of all wealth. The blessings of the Government, like the dews of heaven, should be dispensed alike on the rich and poor, the high and low." In these words the hero of New Orleans presented the true ideal and the true ambition of a democratic Democracy. Instead of exalting and crowning kings, whether kings by inheritance, or kings by accumulated wealth, or kings by military glory, Andrew Jackson taught that, in his judgment, notwithstanding his own success in war and in politics, after all "Labor in peace is the

source of all wealth." It was Jackson's belief and inspiration, notwithstanding the undying wealth of fame which he earned in war, that labor should be crowned as the source of all wealth; and when he said "Labor is the source of all wealth," he did not mean merely wealth of accumulated dollars. He knew as well as the Greek mathematician that there is no royal road to geometry. He knew that neither the poor loafer nor the rich loafer ever added anything to the world's wealth. He knew that "Labor conquers all."

It was labor in peace that made Athens the mother of learning. Without labor the world would never have had its wealth of literature, sculpture, and architecture; without labor the world would never have had its wealth of music, poetry, and painting; without labor the world would never have had its steam engine, nor its electric-power plant; without labor the world would never have had its chemical laboratories, nor its transcontinental telephone, telegraph, and railway systems; without labor the world would never have had its farms or plantations, its highways, its viaducts, its aqueducts, its magnificent cities, nor its majestic steamers, plowing the ocean prairies of the world.

Well could Lincoln say, "Labor is prior to capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the highest consideration." With equal force it was said by Jefferson that "the Government should not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned;" and these expressions of Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln furnish us the true test by which we may know the democratic Democrats of this year 1901 and by which test we may separate the statesmen from politicians and political brokers. If Democracy as an organized faction or party in this country is to have a future worthy of consideration, it will be only because the leaders of that Democracy believe something rather than because they merely want something.

A democratic Democrat is a man seeking an opportunity to do something for everybody. A degenerate Democrat is a man seeking an opportunity to do everything for himself.

For many centuries the world has heard too much of the divine rights of kings and the vested rights of property. If there is to be a future of Democracy in this trust-ridden country, it will be because the leaders of men have secured a following of a majority who are determined to devote some considerable time to the consideration of the divine right of being men and women, fashioned after the image of their Maker in their moral and intellectual stature. If there is to be a future of the Democracy, it will be because the leaders of men in this Republic have educated a majority of the voters of the land to a belief in the divine and vested right of labor as well as the vested right of property.

Although this Government was dedicated to guarantee life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to every human being, yet today the greedy money grubbers of the land—the trustocracy and their tools—have constituted themselves an oligarchy dominating municipal, State, and national legislatures and subordinating every patriotic thought and every moral purpose to the low creed and constitution of "commercialism." Bribery, perjury, and even assassination are resorted to to perpetuate the powers of greed and gluttony.

Instead of subordinating the American Government to the will, purpose, and gluttony of millionaires, who are piling unnecessary millions upon their millions annually; instead of legislating so that the rich shall become richer and the poor poorer from year to year, it is the duty of Democracy to devote itself to the right to work. I am not disposed to overthrow by any violent legislation either the right of the landlord to rent or the right of the capitalist to interest, but inasmuch as we have been zealous in framing constitutions and statutes to protect the landlords and the capitalists, and have even gone so far as to organize armies for that purpose, is not it now high time that we also concern ourselves about labor's right to work? No able-bodied and willing man or woman should be obliged to beg for the privilege of earning an honest living. Every man and every woman with a moral purpose and a healthy body should be spared the humiliation of becoming either a beggar or a thief. Men and women with worthy ambition and physical ability denied the right to work in a continent like this are standing monuments, speaking and moving signboards, bearing witness to the ignorance or the insincerity and barbarous brutality of every legislator and executive in the land who does not cry out in angry protest against such a condition as this in a land that needs as much to be done as is needed in America.

How much do men make of the rusting down of great furnaces, of the crumbling and decaying of great manufacturing establishments that stand in idleness here and there throughout the Republic. How much more reasonable would it be if they concerned themselves with the rust and decay of millions of able-bodied men and women who would gladly contribute their energy, their health, and their strength to better this great continent and make it a home worthy of the intelligence, the character, and the ambition of men like Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln.

Let us for the next few years make it the prime thought and the constant and instant prayer of a democratic Democracy to secure for labor the right to work. Think of the millions of acres of arid land that could be made as fruitful as the valley of the Mississippi by a great national irrigation system. Think of the millions of acres of land in the valleys of the Missouri, the Ohio, and the Mississippi that could be redeemed and reclaimed and made homes as happy as Paradise by a proper system of national levees. Think of the great ships out upon the oceans of the world that could be welcomed at Chicago, at Columbus, at Cleveland, and at Buffalo if we had the proper intelligence and patriotic purpose in the American Congress to spend a few millions of dollars giving labor the right to work in constructing ship canals connecting Lake Michigan with the Mississippi River and Lake Erie with the Ohio River and the Atlantic Ocean.

Think for a moment of the great gigantic strides that would be made in the American Republic if labor were given the right to work in the construction of a postal telegraph and telephone system that would connect every post-office in the most remote township in the land with the great centers of commercial and intellectual activity. Think of the great moral, social, intellectual, and commercial development that would follow the privilege of sending a message of 50 words to any part of the United States under the lightning wings of electricity, at the small expenditure of 10 cents and receiving an answer in an hour or two instead of a week or two, whether you send the telegram to the neighboring town or from the Atlantic to the Pacific, pay for the same a nominal sum, just as we do now for a street-car ride. It is remarkable that the American people have not long before this demanded a postal telegraph and telephone with the instructive example of the postal system before them, which, almost without a cent of expenditure in the way of taxation, is self-sustaining, carrying newspapers for nothing within the county boundaries, and at the cost of but a cent a pound beyond that radius, and carrying letters even to the Philippine Islands, to Alaska, and to Porto Rico for a 2-cent stamp.

The postal system of this country, a kind of governmental trust, if you please, furnishes transportation now to the people so cheap that they scarcely realize it as an expense at all, and yet it is operated substantially without taxation. Were the Government to pay for that service which it receives by the use of its frank, there would be no deficit whatever. In fact the Post-Office Department of the National Government is the only Department which is without a deficit. The War Department, the Navy Department, and all the other Departments are in substance nothing else except deficits.

And, above all places, here at Baltimore should the work of education begin in behalf of the governmental postal telegraph and telephone. It was by the assistance of the Government of the United States that the Morse telegraph line between Baltimore and Washington was first constructed and first operated. What a sad commentary it is upon the intelligence of the American people that after having promoted and established the telegraph they should have allowed it to become the monopoly of a few individuals. For the sake of our own self-respect as a nation, for the purpose of demonstrating that we are still a progressive rather than a decaying nation, let us begin here and now demanding that the people construct for their own use a postal telegraph and telephone system, such that we can reach every post-office in the most remote township of the Republic for the mere nominal sum of 10 cents for 50 words instead of the exorbitant charge of 50 cents for 10 words. Let us avail ourselves of the improved instruments of telegraphy such as have been pointed out by Professor Ely, of the University of Wisconsin, and Professor Rolands, of your own Johns Hopkins University.

What, then, as to the future of Democracy? As for me and for mine, the Democracy which I have in mind has a mission and a moral purpose, and that is to keep its six and a half millions of men organized as they now are, and to propose to the people of the world that the American Republic shall not exist half slave and half free; to propose to the world to make restitution and reparation to the progress of civilization by repentance for the brutal war we are making in the Philippine Islands, for the indifference we have shown to the murder of two republics in South Africa.

Let the Democracy of the future, in addition to pledging itself anew to the cause of equality, honesty, and liberty, as promoted by Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln, also pledge itself to guarantee, not alone to the landlord his rent and to the capitalist his interest, but above all to guarantee to labor the right to work. Let the future Democracy say that inasmuch as Jefferson was proud of his Declaration of Independence and his University of Virginia, so shall the Democracy of 1904 be proudest of its declaration of independence of labor and its university and universal education that will follow the establishment of the postal telegraph and telephone. My friends, were I the dictator of the Democratic party I would first order the murdering of the Filipinos

to cease, and if I went before the American people in 1904 with a national platform of but a single plank it would be with a proposition to proceed at once with the construction of a telegraph and telephone system in connection with the postal system of the land. Give the American people the opportunity of hearing and seeing and knowing facts enough about the real condition of this Government and the real possibilities of human energy, and greater strides will be made in this new century than were made in the last century. If Democracy is to have a future, its mission and purpose must be to lift men up rather than hold men down.

God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands.
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office can not buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor, men who will not lie.

Tall men, sun crowned, who live above the fog
In public duties and in private thinking.

The Tyranny of the Majority.

The tyranny of the majority is now generally included among the evils against which society requires to be on its guard. (John Stuart Mill on Liberty.)

I have lived long enough to outlive my faith in government by the majority. I have lived long enough to learn that there is no such tyranny as the tyranny of the majority. (Grote.)

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN J. LENTZ,
OF OHIO.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 20, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 14236) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes—

Mr. LENTZ said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I move to strike out the last word. I desire to have read by the Clerk an extract from the Columbus Citizen of the 18th of February.

The Clerk read as follows:

LELAND DEAD—FORMER MEMBER OF LEGISLATURE DIES OF CONSUMPTION

Dairy and Food Commissioner Blackburn received a telegram this morning from Inspector I. F. Knouff, of Caldwell, Noble County, saying that Hon. Charles Leland, United States Territorial judge for New Mexico, and a member of the seventy-second and seventy-third general assemblies, died at 1 a. m. Monday.

The deceased leaves a wife and one child. Consumption was the cause of death. Mr. Leland has been fighting this dread disease for a number of years, and as a member of the house had much trouble in attending the sessions regularly. He was counted on as an anti-Hanna man, but at the last moment in the great Senatorial contest turned to Hanna, voted for him, and was appointed judge of the Federal court of New Mexico. He was a candidate for speaker at the same session of the general assembly.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Leland is dead. He died of consumption. A nonpartisan paper of the city of Columbus records the fact that he was an anti-HANNA man in the Senatorial contest in the legislature of Ohio in January, 1898, and states as a fact that he received this appointment to a judicial place in consideration of his vote for Mr. HANNA for a seat in the United States Senate. Note the language: "He was counted on as an anti-HANNA, but at the last moment voted for him and was appointed judge of the Federal court of New Mexico." It seems to me that when statements like this go out to the public in nonpartisan papers as mere matters of everyday fact they ought to be accepted as startling additional evidence supplemental to that which was filed with the United States Senate recording the action of the Ohio State senate, certifying that the seat of Mr. HANNA had been purchased and secured by bribery. Here is a matter of fact certificate in the columns of the nonpartisan Columbus Citizen showing that, so far as the public mind is concerned, it is universally accepted and understood that Mr. Leland received appointment to judicial place from the President of the United States in consideration of his vote for Mr. HANNA as Senator of the United States.

Is it possible that the body politic, that the Union itself, is in a state of consumption as well as Mr. Leland? Is it possible that all of the moral backbone of this Republic is being consumed by these corrupt practices of electing United States Senators by State legislators who are for sale either for money or for appointment to

judicial and consular place? It seems to me that more important than any other issue before the American people is this wholesale system of bribery all along the line, beginning down in the slums and the sewers, the stables, and the alleys of the cities, and rapidly extending to the townships and the farms.

Just as the rotten apple in the barrel taints and corrupts all the apples touching it, so will bribes paid by Presidential appointments in consideration of votes for United States Senators in due time rot and corrupt every boy and girl in the land. Bad as is the purchase of votes at a dollar or two apiece in the stables and alleys, yet infinitely and infamously worse is the appointment of members of legislatures to judicial place in consideration of their votes for United States Senators. My opposition to the present methods of the Government of this Republic strikes deep down at the root of imperialism. I would rather have an inherited monarch on the throne than to have a man who secures the Presidential power by the use of trustocracy funds of this country and then parcels out judicial office in consideration of votes for United States Senators.

Mr. STEELE. I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. STEELE. Jumping on a dead man is not pertinent to the paragraph.

Mr. LENTZ. I am not jumping on a dead man; I am jumping on a man who is so much alive that the papers report he will ride down Pennsylvania avenue next Monday a week with the President of the United States as a fit companion of the President, notwithstanding this solemn record of judicial place prostituted and given to Leland for a vote for HANNA for United States Senator; in fact, I am jumping on two live men, for is President McKinley less guilty than his master?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a word.

Mr. LENTZ. I ask that my time be continued for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I trust not.

Mr. LENTZ. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I hope not, and that amounts to an objection, because I want to get on with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. LENTZ. Availing myself of the general leave accorded to print for the next five days, I desire to submit that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] availed himself of the power of the majority to prevent me from finishing my proposed disclosure of supplemental evidences which have come to light since the adjournment of the seventy-third general assembly of Ohio, emphasizing very materially the evidences reported by the Ohio State senate to the effect that—

The authorized agents and representatives of MARCUS A. HANNA attempted to bribe John C. Otis, a member of the house of representatives, to vote for him for United States Senator.

The gentleman from Illinois undertook to divert the mind of the House as well as of the country from the real matter I had in hand by exercising a privilege as chairman of the committee of holding the floor and making a personal attack on me, all the while refusing to permit me to reply; and after having, under the rules, silenced me from further discussion, with great bravery he bawled out, "Brave men fight the living," and I merely want to suggest that parliamentary bravery would have suggested that after that remark the gentleman from Illinois would have extended me the right of the floor to reply to his unwarranted and unmanly attack.

Examining the Congressional Directory, I find that the gentleman from Illinois was 25 years old at the beginning of the civil war and nearly 30 at its close. He had ample opportunity to show his bravery in the face of the living at that time. He had equal opportunity to show his loyalty by his actions at that time rather than his words at this time; but, unfortunately for himself and his record, he was one of the stay-at-home brave men when the life of the Union was at stake, and now boasts long and loud about his loyalty then and his loyalty now. Turning to his autobiography in the Congressional Directory, I see that the gentleman from Illinois has continuously had his mouth welded to the public tent since 1861, and when he said with so much emphasis that he was always loyal he forgot to finish his sentence by saying that he was always loyal to the public tent.

I am ready, under these circumstances, to accept with complacent contempt any comment that may be made by the gentleman from Illinois, and particularly when he avails himself of the power of a majority on his side of the House to prevent me from disclosing the facts which he and his arrogant associates would not permit to be brought to the attention of the country. Had the gentleman from Illinois been brave enough to permit me to finish my remarks, I would have reminded him and his partisan associates that out of a committee of five appointed by the Ohio State senate of the seventy-third general assembly four reported as follows:

The evidence taken by your committee, in its judgment, proves four main facts:

1. That on or about January 9, 1898, an attempt was made to bribe John C. Otis,

a member of the house of representatives of the present general assembly of the State of Ohio, to vote for MARCUS A. HANNA for United States Senator.

2. That Henry H. Boyce was the principal offender in the commission of that crime.

3. That Maj. E. G. Rathbone and Maj. Charles F. Dick were agents of MARCUS A. HANNA, and procured, aided, and abetted Henry H. Boyce to commit the crime.

4. That H. H. Hollenbeck aided said Henry H. Boyce in committing that crime.

And I would also have shown that the committee reported as follows:

Your committee was anxious from the beginning of this investigation that HANNA, DICK, Rathbone, Boyce, and Hollenbeck should be heard; that they should offer evidence, and that they should make a complete vindication of themselves. To this end subpoenas were sent out for Hollenbeck, and Boyce was inquired after. Both of them fled from the country, going beyond the jurisdiction of the senate and of your committee.

Your committee sent subpoenas and respectful invitations to HANNA, DICK, and Rathbone to appear before the committee. They were sent by registered letters, and the evidence returned herewith shows that those for DICK and Rathbone were received by J. A. Hanna, and that the one sent to Senator HANNA was received and accepted by the postmaster of the United States Senate.

Your committee waited for several weeks, and kept the investigation open to give these men the utmost opportunity to furnish evidence, which they not only neglected and refused to do, but purposely absented themselves from this State, and are now in the city of Washington and within the jurisdiction of the United States Senate, which can effectively compel their attendance for evidential purposes.

Your committee believes from the evidence taken that the authorized agents and representatives of MARCUS A. HANNA attempted to bribe John C. Otis, a member of the house of representatives, to vote for him for United States Senator.

I would also have shown that the Ohio State senate certified this report and finding by a majority vote as the report of the Ohio State senate to the United States Senate. I would also have shown that Charles A. Leland was not the only member of the seventy-third general assembly of Ohio who received an appointment from the President of the United States, and as a reward for his vote for MARCUS A. HANNA for United States Senator.

The mere fact that Leland is dead need not shock the saintly souls of the gentlemen from Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, each of whom availed himself of the opportunity so easily secured by the majority, all the while denying to me the right to have even so much as ten minutes in exchange for fifteen for themselves. Honest and patriotic citizens ought to be pleased to have fifteen minutes in a debate against ten, if they have any honest faith in their ability to demonstrate that Mr. Leland and others whom I shall mention did not receive their appointments as bribes, parceled out by the President of the United States, in consideration of their votes for United States Senator.

The quotations which I have made from the Ohio State senate demonstrate that Mr. HANNA, Mr. McKinley, Mr. DICK, Mr. Rathbone, and others were well aware—or more ignorant than any other Americans if they did not know—that there was an investigation going on in the Ohio State senate charging bribery and crime equaled only by such treason as made Benedict Arnold infamous in American history. In fact, Benedict Arnold was not capable of any greater treachery to the principles of the American Government than is the man who secures a seat either in the Senate or the lower House of Congress by bribery, and men with conscience and self-respect and American courage will not undertake to dismiss charges of the highest legislative body of the State with a sneer and without courting a full and complete investigation. Men of conscience and self-respect would not run away from the State beyond the reach of subpoenas when charged with crime. If they were entirely innocent they would gladly go back and face their accusers and call for proof.

Had the majority side of the House permitted me to finish my remarks I would have added the entire list of appointments made by President McKinley, Mr. HANNA, and others as rewards for votes for Mr. HANNA for United States Senator; and the majority, fearing this, preferred to guffaw and otherwise prevent any further evidence demonstrating the fact that Mr. HANNA secured his election to the United States Senate by bribes, some of which were paid by the President of the United States. I intended then to read, and do now submit, an article which appeared in the Columbus Press-Post of the 17th of February, 1901. The article explains itself as having been prepared by the political correspondent of that paper in reply to a denial made by Mr. Tompkins, whom I charged with having secured his election to Congress in the last campaign by bribery. The article is as follows:

FEDERAL APPOINTMENTS USED BY MCKINLEY TO ASSIST HANNA IN HIS SENATORIAL FIGHT—OVERWHELMING PROOF THAT PRESIDENT OF UNITED STATES WAS IN LEAGUE WITH HIS "BOSS" IN MEMORABLE CONTEST OF 1896.

When Mr. Emmett Tompkins responded to the charges filed by Congressman LENTZ in the Congressional contest case he took occasion to say that William McKinley, as President of the United States, had not assisted MARCUS A. HANNA in the latter's Senatorial fight in Ohio during the winter of 1898.

Not only did Mr. Tompkins defend the President, but he went further and said that it was treasonable for any citizen to enjoy the privileges of free speech if in the course of his remarks he incidentally accused the President with dealing out Federal patronage to assist the man who had a mortgage on him to a seat in the United States Senate, even if that seat was obtained under false pretenses from John Sherman, who had always been the President's political friend.

In doing this Mr. Tompkins evidently overlooked his hand. He forgot for the moment the history in the case. He forgot how John Sherman was tweedled out

of the United States Senate and into the Cabinet and out of the latter place into retirement and eventually to his death by a broken heart. He forgot that the record would show that more members of the general assembly which elected MARCUS A. HANNA a United States Senator had been appointed to Federal positions than had the members of any of the legislative bodies which met before or after that time. He also overlooked the fact that the most of the members of that body who received something were those who first opened their mouths in opposition to HANNA's election.

Mr. Tompkins has forgotten all of these things, but to bring them back to him that he may never again overlook them The Press-Post herewith prints the list of Federal appointments given by President McKinley to members of the legislature who selected MARCUS A. HANNA. The senate list follows:

Lewis Voight, Cincinnati, Hamilton County, United States surveyor of the port at that point.

Henry J. May, Kenton, Hardin County, paymaster, United States Army.

John J. Sullivan, Warren, Trumbull County, United States attorney northern district of Ohio.

Martin Dodge, East Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, member United States Good Roads Commission.

The members of the house affected by President McKinley's kindheartedness were more numerous, and for Mr. Tompkins's information the Press-Post publishes it, as follows:

Josiah M. Allen, Athens, Athens County, who swore that he would never vote for HANNA, but did vote for him, and secured the appointment of his father-in-law, J. W. Jones, to be United States pension agent in this city. Mr. Allen is himself acting as a clerk in Mr. Jones's office, and receives \$2,400 per year for his services.

A. M. Griffith, Sabina, Clinton County, deceased. Had his son appointed to consularship in Mexico.

Philip M. Ashford, Sabineville, Columbiana County, was given United States attorneyship at Washington, D. C.

Charles E. Bowman, Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, appointed auditor Cleveland post-office. Resigned recently to seek Republican nomination for mayor of the Forest City, but later withdrew from the contest.

Charles W. Parker, Berea, Cuyahoga County, appointed lieutenant in United States Army.

J. J. Snider, Xenia, Greene County, had the promise that his brother-in-law would be made postmaster at Oxford, Ohio, but when the time came the brother-in-law failed of appointment.

Rufus W. Lane, Hamilton County, appointed as consul to Smyrna.

James W. Bell, London, Madison County, appointed deputy revenue collector in this city. Was later reduced to a clerkship.

J. O. Clark, Dowington, Meigs County. The man who worked Clark for HANNA was William Huntley, who was made postmaster of Pomeroy for his good service. Huntley went short in his accounts about a year ago.

Charles A. Leland, Caldwell, Noble County, appointed as United States judge at Socorro, N. Mex.

A. T. McCormick, Portsmouth, Scioto County, appointed as attorney to a United States bank receiver in southern Ohio.

John E. Griffith, Marysville, Union County, who permitted his wife to be dragged about the city in a carriage at a late hour of night by those seeking his influence with her husband, was appointed as a clerk in the United States court at Socorro.

Alexander Boxwell, Franklin, Warren County, appointed as attorney for a United States bank receiver.

It will be noticed that in all this list of those who at one time asserted that they would never support HANNA, only one was turned down. All of the rest changed their minds, and history records the fact that they have been the recipients of Federal favors. They have received these from the hands of William McKinley. Is Mr. Tompkins enlightened?

I shall not go into details as to this list of names, but I take the time to recall here the fact that as permanent chairman of the Democratic State convention held at Dayton, Ohio, on the 23d and 24th of August, 1898, I called upon the Republicans to explain the appointment of Rufus W. Lane to Smyrna. On that subject at that State convention I am reported by the press of the State to have spoken as follows:

AN ADMINISTRATION HALO.

There has been a great effort at painting a halo around the Administration, trying to keep your eyes so busy watching the halo that you do not get to see the "boss" from Cleveland, who is alleged to have bought his seat in the United States Senate, and against whom charges have been filed by the State senate of Ohio that he holds that title by bribery and fraud.

A man by the name of Rufus W. Lane, elected in Cincinnati on the Democratic ticket, proclaiming himself to voters as a Silver Republican, has within a few days been appointed to a consularship at Smyrna—sending him out of the land to a foreign country. [Hissses.] I do not wonder that you hiss at such a stretch to the nostrils of decent men—\$2,500 in fees and \$2,500 in salary for Rufus Lane's treachery. Poor Rufus Lane, ashamed to face his neighbors, without the countenance to stay at home, secures a \$5,000 place from President McKinley and MARK HANNA, although elected on the Democratic ticket. I do not wonder at his wanting to go to Smyrna. I should think he would have wanted to go to a hotter country. [Laughter and applause.]

Frequently since the Democratic convention at Dayton in 1898 have Democratic speakers throughout the Buckeye land called upon the Republicans to answer, if they dare, and explain this appointment of Rufus W. Lane, this Judas Iscariot who betrayed his party and his country for some reason, and it is still in order for some one to explain, when thousands of Republicans were begging for appointments, why Rufus W. Lane, elected on the Democratic ticket, was appointed to consular place by President McKinley, if it was not because Lane furnished the deciding vote which secured Mr. HANNA a seat in the United States Senate. In this connection I also offer a letter written me by a gentleman living in Cincinnati, who offers to make affidavit as to the declarations made by Rufus W. Lane. The letter is as follows:

A. KAPLUN, MERCHANT TAILOR, GRAND HOTEL BUILDING,
Cincinnati, February 18, 1901.

HON. JOHN J. LENTZ,
Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR SIR: Have just finished reading your reply to Hon. Emmett Tompkins, published in Saturday's Enquirer, and wish to say to you that Dr. Rufus W. Lane,

while a candidate for the legislature of Ohio on the Democratic fusion ticket in 1897, was given an invitation, as was the other legislative candidate, to address the L. A. W. at a special meeting held in the rooms of the Cincinnati Bicycle Club, of which club he was also a member, the L. A. W. wishing to obtain the views of the candidates on matters of importance to them.

Dr. Rufus W. Lane did at that meeting make the statement that he would not vote for MARCUS A. HANNA *for United States Senator.*

I was a member and also treasurer of the L. A. W. consulate and their representative at that meeting, and heard him make the above remarks, which I stand ready to make a sworn statement to if it is of any use to you.

I was always a Republican until the fall of 1897, and, being against M. A. HANNA and his methods, I voted the fusion ticket to help defeat M. A. HANNA for the United States Senate.

Yours, truly,

A. KAPLUN.

I also call attention to the name of John E. Griffith, of Marysville, Union County, in the above list. This man Griffith was a member of the Seventy-third general assembly, and not only did he refuse to vote for Mr. HANNA, but his wife joined with him, and both made exposure of the fact that long after midnight she was betrayed by falsehood into leaving the hotel at which she and her husband were stopping, and was taken to the hotel at which Mr. HANNA was stopping, and was there urged and begged and, according to the newspapers, was promised to be taken care of by the Hanna administration if she would induce her husband to vote for Mr. HANNA for United States Senator. A little later on Mr. Griffith changed his mind and voted for HANNA for Senator, and was appointed clerk of the same court in New Mexico to which Charles Leland was appointed judge.

What honest American citizen is not humiliated and chagrined to know that immediately following the votes of Leland and Griffith for HANNA for United States Senator they were sent by the McKinley Administration to New Mexico, one to preside as judge of a Federal court and the other to serve as record keeper of the same court? We hang men on circumstantial evidence. What stronger circumstantial evidence could be desired to witness the fact that here in New Mexico were placed in charge of a Federal court two criminals as gross and coarse as ever were incarcerated in any penitentiary in the land? Consular and judicial places filled in consideration of votes for a United States Senator! Well can one say with *Æschines*:

Most of all, fellow-citizens, if your sons ask whose example they shall imitate, what will you say? For you know well it is not music, nor the gymnasium, nor the schools that mold young men; it is much more—the public proclamation, the public example. If you take one whose life has no high purpose and crown him in the theater, every boy who sees it is corrupted. Beware, therefore, Athenians, remembering posterity will rejudge your judgment, and that the character of a city is determined by the character of the men it crowns.

I recommend this page of *Æschines* to William McKinley and to all of his partisan caterers in the House of Representatives; and let us never forget the old saying that "When the emperor makes his horse a consul, honest men will decline a share in the consulship."

In this connection I submit a question and a comment from the editorial page of the Columbus Press-Post. They explain themselves and are as follows:

If the HANNA organs think Congressman LENTZ a demagogue for merely mentioning the fact that President McKinley appointed Leland to a United States judgeship and Rufus W. Lane as consular representative to hoist our flag in a foreign country, what name will they call President McKinley for making these appointments immediately after they had voted for HANNA for Senator?

When the Republicans in Congress refused to accept Congressman LENTZ's challenge to give him ten minutes to General GROSVENOR's fifteen minutes to discuss the HANNA bribery, they completely demonstrated to every intelligent American that our capital district Congressman is a man they fear; and this also explains why they corrupted the voters of the district in their determination to prevent Mr. LENTZ telling them and the people some plain truths in the next Congress.

I submit also an editorial comment made by the Hon. H. H. McFadden, in the Steubenville Gazette, which is as follows:

Now that the proposed prize fight at Cincinnati has been effectually knocked out by Governor Nash, we respectfully suggest to him that there are other evils far greater than prize fighting to which he might turn his attention with benefit to the State. But the greatest of all evils affecting the body politic, and which saps the very foundations of free government, is the systematic corruption of the electorate by wholesale bribery in innumerable forms, an offense beside which the worst slugging match that ever was fought to a finish pales into insignificance. Ohio is now represented in the United States Senate by a man whose election was secured by bribery, and the President of the United States, also an Ohioan, was the distributor of rewards for several legislative votes cast for this Senator, while the President himself is the most notable beneficiary of bribery and its companion, bulldozing, that the history of America affords. Here is the field of all others in which Ohio's uplifting governor can show his determination that evils opposed to both law and morals shall no longer exist in the State in which he has the executive power.

I have no personal ill will against McKinley and HANNA, and I regret as much as any man can the necessity of making these facts known; but I am not unmindful of the duty of American citizenship, and particularly the officeholding citizenship, whose work is that of serving the Government in representative and legislative capacity. I insist upon it that the diplomacy of the minority consists in exposing the hypocrisy of the majority. The efforts of the minority have been defeated at every stage, since I have been in Congress, where we have undertaken any reform legislation. We undertook to couple with the Dingley tariff an income tax. The trustocracy compelled the Republican side of the House to defeat this provision.

We undertook to couple with the Dingley law an anti-trust provi-

sion and have several times since undertaken to provide legislation against the evils of the trusts, but the agents and servants of the trusts on the majority side of the House have just as persistently defeated every such measure. We have been zealous in our effort to expose the beef trust, but the President's commission whitewashed it. We undertook to expose the Egan pardon, but a partisan majority did its utmost to sneer that down. We undertook to expose the misrepresentations as to the real conditions in the Philippines, but a censored press has continued to deceive the people on this subject.

We undertook to expose the establishment of tyranny and martial law to destroy union labor in the Coeur d'Alene district of Idaho, but a partisan majority thwarted that effort, and in their fear of exposure refused to give the people of the country even so much as a single copy of the testimony taken in that memorable investigation. We instituted an investigation of the President's appointment of Orson Smith and J. C. Graham, the polygamist postmasters at Logan and Provo City, Utah. The report of the committee to investigate was substantially suppressed, and meanwhile the President quietly secured the resignation of each of these polygamists and had other postmasters substituted in their place, all the while, however, perpetuating, ratifying, and confirming slavery and polygamy in the Sulu Islands.

Lest some may forget, I repeat here the estimate made by Harper's Weekly of date 28th March, 1896, and by the Columbus Evening Dispatch, a well-known Ohio organ of the Hannaites. They are as reproduced in the Columbus Press-Post as follows:

M'KINLEY AS HE IS—IMBECILE, CORRUPT, AND SELFISH AS GOVERNOR AND UNFIT FOR THE PRESIDENCY—KNEW NOTHING OF THE STATE'S AFFAIRS, AND NEGLECTED HER INTERESTS WHILE PLOTTING FOR PRESIDENTIAL HONORS—SCANDALS IN PUBLIC CHARITIES, AND BANKRUPTCY OF THE STATE'S TREASURY DURING HIS ADMINISTRATION—HIS HYPOCRISY AND VAPORARINESS ON THE SILVER QUESTION AND IGNORANCE OF OTHER PUBLIC INTERESTS—HIS CLAIM TO HAVE MADE THE TARIFF BEARING HIS NAME A PREPOSTEROUS FRAUD—SCATHING ANALYSIS OF HIS POLITICAL CHARACTER BY HARPER'S WEEKLY AND THE COLUMBUS EVENING DISPATCH.

[From Harper's Weekly of March 28, 1896. Republished with editorial approval in the Columbus Evening Dispatch.]

THE CANDIDACY OF M'KINLEY.

Some of the politicians seem to have arrived at the conclusion that Mr. McKinley will probably receive the Republican nomination for President, and one Democratic newspaper has made a calculation of his strength in the convention on the first ballot, and asserts that he will have 564 votes of a total of 910.

The history of promising candidacies is largely a record of failures, and Mr. McKinley may possibly make one more in the list of those who have received the largest number of votes in convention on the first ballot only to lose the prize in the end by reason of a hostile combination of the opposing candidates. But if he is nominated at St. Louis the Republican party will have done almost the worst that it now seems possible for it to do, for even Speaker Reed, little as he has to commend him to the people of the United States, would be a stronger candidate than McKinley.

The author of the McKinley bill is an amiable man, with a pleasing manner of speech, but of all the men who in the last twenty years have risen to leadership in the House of Representatives, we know of no one, with the exception of Mr. Springer, whose leadership was nominal and not real, with less capacity for the post either in character or intellect. During his chairmanship of the Ways and Means Committee he was the tool and servant of the protected manufacturers. It was to do their bidding that he was placed at the head of the committee that is theoretically charged with the duty of preparing measures for raising revenue for the support of the Government. He carried out the purpose and intent of his selection. He became the nominal author of a measure of which its beneficiaries were the real authors. It was not a measure for supplying the Government with the ways and means for its maintenance; it was a measure for increasing the profits of a favored few at the expense of the overtaxed many. The country expressed its opinion of Mr. McKinley's effort at the election immediately following the enactment of the law by choosing a large Democratic majority to the House of Representatives. Mr. McKinley himself was defeated, and it was because of his martyrdom that a sympathetic party nominated him for governor of Ohio.

This election to the governorship was ample recompense for the stings occasioned by the loss of his seat in Congress, so that there is no reason for his nomination for the Presidency except that which led to his appointment as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. That reason is, as we have already explained, that Mr. McKinley will do whatever is commanded by the men who insist on having the right to tax the people of the United States for their own profit. In other words, he is the chief of the sect of extreme protectionists who believe that all Americans ought to pay high prices for the necessities of life in order that a few Americans may gain riches by manufacturing them, and that to this end it is right and constitutional to levy taxes directly for the benefit of private citizens, making the public revenue a secondary or incidental consideration.

He is the chief politician of this sect, not because he is a great economist—he has not even an ordinary acquaintance with the subject—not because he originates ideas, or on his own initiative develops and stimulates protective legislation, but simply and solely because he is willing to take orders from certain manufacturers who know what they want, and who are willing to pay large sums to secure a political agent who will turn over to them the taxing power to do with it as they will.

It is not to be wondered at, then, that the Republican opponents of McKinley are making charges touching the virtue of the men who are conducting his campaign. They are saying that rich manufacturers have been corrupting the primaries throughout the country, and that delegates have been purchased.

However that may be, it is clear that a public man must gain a reputation that unfits him for the Presidency if he is the servant of those who are interested in government only as it inures to their pecuniary profit. Whether Mr. McKinley's strength in the convention has or has not been procured by the corrupt use of money, whether, if it has been, he is or is not a party to the corruption, he is the candidate of those who want to divert the Government from its constitutional functions of promoting the general welfare that its chief power may be used for their own selfish purposes. And it is because Mr. McKinley has already permitted himself to be employed as the agent of such men, and is presumably willing to be so employed again, that the extreme protectionists show such anxiety to bring about his nomination that prominent men of their own party are led to accuse them of employing corrupt means to accomplish their end.

Another aspect of this candidacy is that Mr. McKinley is not only the chief of the extreme protectionists, but he has heretofore been for unsound money, and is now, if we are to believe the platform of the Ohio State convention which nominated him, in favor of bimetalism, either through international arrangement or, if that can not be had, through Congressional legislation. In other words, the protected manufacturers, in order to capture the silver vote, for the restoration of the tariff law of 1890 are willing to elect as President a man whose views on the currency are unsound.

It will be difficult—we trust impossible—to elect Mr. McKinley President on the theory that has dominated his canvass for the nomination. The tariff is not to be the issue at the coming election, nor, if it were, do we believe that the country would agree to make another trial of McKinleyism. The issue is to be the currency question. Neither the silver men nor the gold-standard advocates are likely to support a double dealer merely because he is ready to do the bidding of the men who are now working for his nomination. If the Republican party has really come under the control of the beneficiaries of the tariff of 1890, and if, therefore, its convention nominate McKinley in grateful recognition of past tariff favors and in hope of like favors to come, in order to make the tariff issue prominent the party is to face both ways on the currency issue, the leaders who are anticipating a triumph at the coming election are likely to be grievously disappointed; for no matter what the politicians may think the country wants the money issue settled, and the question that will be put to candidates in the approaching campaign is, "Where do you stand on the money question?"

To this question Mr. McKinley has not yet made a reply that is satisfactory to the advocates of sound money. Nay, he has more than once ranged himself on the side of those who would debase the currency in order that 50 cents might be made to pay a dollar of indebtedness. Although he probably would not dare renew his advocacy of such a silver bill as the Sherman law, and although he might fear to stand squarely with Teller, Dubois, Stewart, and his other silver friends, Mr. McKinley does not favor the single gold standard, and therefore his election to the Presidency would be fraught with danger to the best interests of the country.

COMMENTS OF THE COLUMBUS EVENING DISPATCH OF MARCH 27, 1896.

*** The article is so bold, so incisive, so evidently honest in intent, that it will be of special interest to the people of Columbus and of Ohio who know the ex-governor best.

Persons familiar with ex-Governor McKinley, and who separate themselves from all sense of hero worship or sentimentality, will find little in it which they will wish to controvert. Their strongest impression will be one of wonder that the writer in Harper's Weekly was able so skillfully to select the most vulnerable points in the McKinley armor of Napoleonic irreproachability. But while the article is sufficiently explicit to furnish food for serious thought, it might have been more complete and comprehensive had the writer had at his command facts well known in Ohio.

The article in question says McKinley was not the real author of the tariff act which bears his name. That is common and undisputed knowledge. It says he was first elected governor of Ohio because of sympathy arising from his defeat for reelection to Congress. It properly might have added that for the four years following McKinley's first inauguration as governor of this State there was an administration chiefly characterized by weakness, indecision, and neglect. Under his "wise foreseeing financial policy" the State of Ohio escaped bankruptcy by borrowing half a million dollars. Under his "careful selection of appointees" there were scandals in half the public institutions of the State, and there probably was extravagance in all of them. He was a destructionist in the affairs of Ohio and a destructionist in the affairs of the Republican party, because he wanted to be a constructionist in the affairs of William McKinley.

From the day he was nominated for governor the first time Major McKinley was a candidate for the Presidency. His best friends, speaking confidentially, admit that he is a politician pure and simple, whose every act and every word is carefully weighed with respect to its influence upon his own political future. Therefore Ohio had a governor de facto, but none at all in practice, because his time was devoted to a canvass for the Presidency, and all State affairs were made utterly subservient thereto. He knew nothing about State affairs when he was elected, and he did not care to take the trouble to learn anything about them which was not thrust upon him.

Harper's Weekly says that Major McKinley did the bidding of men having personal interests to serve when he was Congressman. It might have added that he did exactly the same thing as governor. At the dictation of men who are now conducting his campaign for the Presidency, he prevented the enactment of legislation which would have provided increased revenue for the State, while at the same time he acquiesced in, if he did not favor, the temporary makeshift of borrowing money to meet current expenses. If he did so much for them, then what will he not do as President? The article in question says he has no opinions about anything save the tariff, or if he has, they are not accompanied by the courage necessary to express them. That is notorious. He would not even talk in newspaper interviews about the Armenian atrocities or the Cuban question.

Major McKinley's manager denies the charge that money is being contributed by the wealthy manufacturing interest toward the expense of his present campaign. But a member of the State committee, when McKinley made his first campaign for governor, is authority for the statement that \$100,000 was contributed by these same capitalists to help in McKinley's election. Here is an inference in this that is fair, and can not be overlooked.

These are not pleasant things to contemplate, but the people have a right to know the facts, ugly though they be, and we have performed the duty of a newspaper to the public in relating them.

In this connection I also submit the caustic comment of Mr. E. L. Godkin, formerly editor of the New York Evening Post, who, writing last fall of the McKinley régime, said—

My opinion of them, formed long ago, is that they are the most dangerous set of scoundrels by which any civilized country was ever beset.

I noticed that some on the Republican side laughed when I said I was a Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln Democrat. I hope this laughter was due to ignorance, and it is easily possible in this age, when those who are now in favor of "criminal aggression" in the Philippine Islands have forgotten that Lincoln said he never entertained a political sentiment which was not inspired by the Declaration of Independence. A number of Democrats of the city of Columbus and the State of Ohio, on the 27th of November, 1900, organized the Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln League, elected me its president, and adopted, on my suggestion, a creed made up of quotations from this triumvirate of America's greatest Presidents, which is set forth in these words:

WE BELIEVE WITH JEFFERSON:

1. All men are created equal.
2. Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.
3. The government should not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned.

4. Our foreign policy should be peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none.

5. The cement of this Union is in the heart-blood of every American. Cherish the Federal Union as the only rock of our safety.

WE BELIEVE WITH JACKSON:

1. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. The path of freedom is continually beset by enemies who assume the disguise of friends.

2. Our Government should be supported by the ballot box and not by the musket.

3. Labor in peace is the source of all wealth. The blessings of the Government, like the dews of heaven, should be dispensed alike upon the rich and poor, the high and low.

4. You have no longer any cause to fear danger from abroad; it is from within, among yourselves—from cupidity, from corruption, from inordinate thirst for power, that factions will be formed and liberty endangered.

5. At every hazard and by every sacrifice this Union must be preserved.

WE BELIEVE WITH LINCOLN:

1. This Government can not endure permanently half slave and half free.

2. Government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth. This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it.

3. Labor is prior to capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the highest consideration.

4. If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide.

5. The Union, the Constitution, and the liberties of the people shall be perpetuated in accordance with the original idea for which the Revolution was made.

The league might also have added as a sixth proposition what Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln thought about the infallibility of the Supreme Court. It does not require a great effort of memory to know that Lincoln and Seward welcomed the "irrepressible conflict," because they recognized a "higher law" than the mere decision of the Supreme Court, and it was for this reason that Lincoln, in his first inaugural address, said:

The candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal.

But it is not extraordinary, after all, that the Republican party, as now organized, should claim to be the follower of Lincoln. They have made much more radical claims than this quite recently. Their Chief Executive pointed out what kind of aggression would be "criminal" according to our code of morality, and, having pointed it out, proceeded immediately to do the very thing which he had characterized as criminal; and to-day the party following him, with a conscience petrified, or ossified at least, claims that this "criminal aggression" is "benevolent assimilation" and "Christian civilization." It is not long since the Chief Executive pointed out our "plain duty," and then refused, himself, to do it, and his partisan associates, with one accord, cried out, "Me, too!"

At the opening of my last campaign I stated my position in a speech made at Hilliards, Ohio, and I submit that I have never made a speech on any public question anywhere or cast a vote in the House of Representatives on any public question which is at variance with any of the principles promulgated by either Jefferson, Jackson, or Lincoln, or any of the other great leaders of American thought and American statesmanship, and I incorporate that speech herein and refer to its quotations in demonstration and in proof of the fact that I am a Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln Democrat. The report of the speech, as given in the Columbus Press-Post, is as follows:

LIVING AND DEAD SPEAK FOR UNION AND PRESERVATION AGAINST EVIL DESIGNS OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY OF TO-DAY—THE OPENING OF THE TWELFTH DISTRICT CAMPAIGN AT HILLIARDS—SPEECH OF HON. JOHN J. LENTZ, DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE FOR CONGRESS.

Mr. LENTZ spoke as follows:

Mr. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Here in Nature's first temple, in the midst of these living pillars and underneath these arches of whispering foliage, our thoughts must of necessity turn to first principles. In temples erected by human hands we are accustomed once a week to meet and study the existence and future of men. Here in this cathedral erected by the hands of Deity it is fitting that we convene to consider the existence and the future of the American Republic. Its existence is not due alone to the Declaration of Independence, in which the founders declared "we hold these truths to be self-evident, first, that all men are created equal; second, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; third, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; fourth, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

This Declaration of Independence is as much a part of the soul of this great Government as is that formal instrument known specifically as the Constitution of the United States. It is often said that England has no written constitution. It might almost as well be said that France, Germany, Spain, Russia, and China have no written constitutions.

THE REAL CONSTITUTION OF EVERY GREAT NATION

is the habit and character of its people in the aggregate. In other words, with nations as with individuals, "handsome is as handsome does."

No, my friends, the Constitution of the United States is not summed up in the formal instrument so denominated, but the real Constitution of the United States comprehends much more than any catalogue of political rights, privileges, and limitations. The real as well as the ideal Constitution of the United States includes the Declaration of Independence signed at Philadelphia and heralded to the world by the sacred vibrations of old Liberty Bell in 1776. Nor does this complete the Constitution of the United States, for Washington's Farewell Address, Jefferson's first inaugural address, the Monroe doctrine, and Lincoln's immortal words at Gettysburg must also be assimilated and incorporated with the very fiber of every pure heart of American citizenship.

On that old Liberty Bell of Independence Hall were these words: "Proclaim

liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." I hope it will be observed by all of you that this old Scriptural commandment was not modified so as to read, "Decalaim liberty throughout all the land." Between a proclamation of liberty and a declaration about liberty there is a wide gulf, so wide, indeed, that the Hon. Webster Davis, who has repeatedly been heralded to the people of the United States in columns of eulogy by the press of the Republican party as the Administration orator, was obliged to repudiate the Republican party, although it had honored him with high official place; and the 25,000 witnesses at the Kansas City convention of his formal abandonment of the Republican party and his manly and patriotic declaration of allegiance to the principles of the Democratic national platform will never forget Mr. Davis's pregnant words when he declared to the people of America and the people of the world that the Republican party as now constituted and dominated by greed at Washington had eliminated from its vocabulary the word "liberty" and had relegated the word "freedom" to the dictionary of obsolete words.

But the Constitution of the United States, or if you please, the soul of the United States, is best expressed in the language of deeds, a language more significant and more emphatic than the language of words. The blood of patriots on Lexington Green and Bunker Hill, the heroic offerings laid upon the altar of liberty by Baron Steuben and Lafayette, the dying declaration of Von Kalb or De Kalb, at Camden, the prayers of George Washington and the privations of his soldiers at Valley Forge, the delivery of the sword of Cornwallis at Yorktown, the undying fame of Andrew Jackson at New Orleans, the proclamation of emancipation, and the martyrdom of Abraham Lincoln are all a part of the unwritten Constitution of the United States, and every American citizen, whether by birth or by naturalization, who does not realize his full indebtedness to these memories and these sacrifices for the cause of freedom is worse than the heathen and utterly unworthy of citizenship in a Republic dedicated to the proposition that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

He who is too indolent to read Washington's Farewell Address, or too ignorant to understand the self-evident propositions of the Declaration of Independence, or consider the principles laid down by Jefferson, Monroe, Jackson, and Lincoln, is unworthy of the right to vote, and ought to be transported as ballast to some one of the countries of Europe, where he might be governed, not by a commission and a military governor, as are the people of Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands, but rather that he might be ruled by that other institution of arrogance and greed which governs by force rather than consent, known as the "Divine right of kings." The insincerity and inconsistency of this jargon about the divine right of kings, is not far different from that vocabulary of buncombe recently invented by the Emperor William, of Canton, Ohio, in his talk about "Duty and destiny," "Christian civilization and benevolent assimilation." Kings are not alone in the practice of stealing "the livery of Heaven to serve the devil in," for we are now witnesses of the fact that the President of the United States, although devoted to the service of Mammon and the trusts, is all the while talking about Christianity, benevolence, duty, and destiny. Verily, verily, you can not serve God and Mammon. Verily, verily, you can not serve the American Republic, and at the same time be the abject slave of the trusts.

By this review of the principles of the founders of our Government, and comparison with the practices of the present, I have sought to have you realize the difference between the governments that proclaim the divine right of kings and our Government, which was instituted upon the axiomatic self-evident human right of self-government. And lest we forget, and in order that we may have still better opportunities of seeing our Government and its tendency, I propose to speak to you in the voices of the dead and living, and in the calling the voices and the admonitions of the dead, I do it, agreeing with Abraham Lincoln, when he said: "We can only wisely guide our course for the future by careful study of the landmarks of the past." And while I am reciting to you the declarations of the living, I desire that you shall note carefully that each and every man from whom I quote is one who supported and advocated the election of William McKinley in 1896, and I leave it for you to decide whether my speech in sum and substance is a Democratic speech or a Republican speech, for I assure you that the living from whom I quote, and whose declarations I adopt and accept, are among the most distinguished and the most honorable men who have a right to claim they are the legitimate successors and heirs to the principles of Abraham Lincoln.

But first let us hear from the dead, and I now quote from the Farewell Address of George Washington:

WASHINGTON'S ADMONITION.

"Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. * * * In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded, and that in place of them just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. * * * Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. * * * So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils."

"Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter without adequate inducement of justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which are apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld."

"Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities."

"Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. * * * Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice? It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world."

JEFFERSON'S ADDRESS.

By Jefferson, in his first inaugural address, the substance of the same thought was most happily expressed in these words:

"Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none;" and later on, when Thomas Jefferson was recognized as the philosopher of the Republic and the sage of Monticello, he wrote to President Monroe on the 24th of October, 1823, these sacred words: "Our first and fundamental maxim should be, never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe. America, North and South, has a set of interests distinct from those of Europe, and peculiarly her own. She should, therefore, have a system of her own separate and apart from that of Europe. While Europe is laboring to become the domicile of despotism, our endeavor should be to make our hemisphere that of freedom."

In passing, does it not occur to you that our European imitation Secretary of State, John Hay, and our lord lieutenant to the Queen, William McKinley, would

do well to read these words of Jefferson and abide by them? Had they believed in these sentiments, or had either of them fully comprehended his oath of office, to support the Constitution of the United States, we would not have been humiliated by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, giving England the right to dictate the terms upon which we are to dig a ditch across the Nicaraguan country. We would not have been humiliated by the miserable and contemptuous treatment given young Macrum, an Ohio boy, because in his youth and simplicity and honesty, he supposed it was his privilege to sympathize with the efforts of the South African Republics in their struggle for liberty.

All his boyhood training in our public schools had been calculated to make him believe that the Declaration of Independence was something real, something earnest, and it was quite natural that while at Pretoria he would sympathize with Oom Paul Kruger just as he had read in our school histories that Baron Steuben and Lafayette had sympathized with George Washington. Had Hay and McKinley profited by the wisdom of Jefferson and Monroe, the American people would not now be humiliated by the surrender of a part of Alaska, of which Russia claimed the ownership and of which we have had the occupancy since 1867. The next time William McKinley asks the question: "Who will haul down the flag," we shall answer: "John Bull, you know." The next time William McKinley asks: "Who will haul down the flag," some boy in the audience will ask the President to consult Queen Victoria on that subject.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Let us quote one paragraph from the Monroe doctrine, as promulgated by President Monroe, so that we may see the servile, cringing, catering of our Government at Washington to Great Britain throughout the struggle for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness by the South African Republics. Among other things, President Monroe made this declaration:

"With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of opposing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

Compare this heroic declaration of President Monroe, at a time when our country had but ten millions of people, with the cowardly conduct of the Republican party in the White House and in Congress, when appealed to for merely a word of sympathy for Africa. Consider the servility of our country to Great Britain, when they refused to hear the appeal of these neighbors for some demonstration to the world that our Government was not in an alliance with England, and as Webster Davis said, "Had this assurance been given, other powers in Europe would have come to the relief of the Boers."

JACKSON'S ADVICE.

Andrew Jackson in his first inaugural address to the people made this significant declaration: "Labor in peace is the source of all wealth;" and if any man in America had a right to believe or preach the doctrine of war, it was Andrew Jackson, because no man came nearer winning immortal fame in blood and fire than did Andrew Jackson at New Orleans. But this great, honest, heroic, and courageous soul was manly enough to admonish the American people never to forget that industry in peace is the source of all wealth, and notwithstanding this declaration we find our European imitation government at Washington today teaching and preaching to the people the sordid doctrine of commercialism and greed to be promoted by bayonets and 13-inch guns. Vainglory and selfishness have supplanted the humane and generous sentiments promulgated by our greatest Presidents.

We are about to enter upon a campaign in which the HANNA school of politicians will prate long and loud about prosperity, contending that unless we continue to be butchers of men in the Philippines, our alleged prosperity will at once come to an end. Think of MARK HANNA telling the people of America that unless they elect his wabbling William he will immediately empty their dinner pails and starve the whole 76,000,000 and leave only a half a million millionaires to own and enjoy the American continent.

Upon what meat doth this Caesar feed that he hath grown so great? Are voters to be made to believe that they are helpless imbeciles and entirely dependent for food and clothing upon the guardianship and good will of an aristocracy of trust owners and operators?

In the face of such an exhibition of arrogance as the proposition made by Mr. HANNA and the capitalists whom he represents, that the people of this country shall not have prosperity except as they eat it from the long handled spoon in the hands of plutocracy, I am reminded of another gem from the political philosophy of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson. It was in a letter written in 1813 by Jefferson to Adams, after both had retired from politics, and it was in these words:

"I agree with you that there is a natural aristocracy among men, the grounds of which are virtue and talents. There is also an artificial aristocracy, founded on wealth and birth, without either virtue or talents. The natural aristocracy I consider as the most precious gift of nature for the instruction and government of society. The artificial aristocracy is a mischievous ingredient in a government, and provision should be made to prevent its ascendancy."

It is

THIS ARTIFICIAL ARISTOCRACY,

founded on wealth, which has cursed this country with its first efforts to establish an empire. But the worst evil, and the most dangerous and most insidious influence of this artificial aristocracy, is its use of the party name in connection with which the name of Lincoln became immortal. Not only shall I give you the voices of the living Republicans a little later on in demonstration of the fact that Hannanism is not Lincoln Republicanism, but I propose to give the language of Abraham Lincoln himself as to his conception of our correct international policy, and the relations which he thought we should sustain, and maintain against all the world. I should like to have every Republican, who claims to revere the name and the memory of Lincoln, hear and consider the following words from him:

LINCOLN'S WORDS.

"At what point shall we expect the approach of danger? Shall we expect some trans-Atlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us at a blow? Never! All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasures of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years. At what point, then, is this approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reach us, it must spring up amongst us. It can not come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide."

And now, while my Republican friends are giving me their attention, I shall make a few more quotations from the voice of Lincoln which may help them to decide whether they are in favor of an empire or whether they prefer to perpetuate the Republic with the principles of Lincoln, as announced at Gettysburg in these words: "It is rather for us to be here, dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation under God

shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

I quote again from Lincoln:

"No man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent."

And again from Lincoln:

"But, soberly, it is now no child's play to save the principles of Jefferson from total overthrow in this nation. * * * The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society, and yet they are denied and evaded, with no small show of success. One dashing call them 'glittering generalities.' Another bluntly calls them 'self-evident lies.' Others insidiously argue that they apply to 'superior races.' These expressions, differing in form, are identical in object and effect, supplanting the principles of free government and restoring those of class, caste, and legitimacy. They would delight a convocation of crowned heads plotting against the people. They are the vanguard, the miners and sappers of returning despotism. We must repulse them, or they will subjugate us. This is a world of compensation, and he who would be no slave must consent to have no slave."

"Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not themselves, and, under a just God, can not long retain it."

And now I quote from Lincoln's great speech at Chicago, on the 10th of July, 1858, that you may see how exceedingly appropriate are his words to the paramount issue of this campaign. I mean these words:

"Those arguments that are made, that the inferior races are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow. What are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for the enslaving of the people in all the ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments of kingcraft were always of this class; they always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. * * * Turn it whatever way you will—whether it comes from the mouth of a king, as an excuse for enslaving the people of his country, or from the mouth of men of one race as a reason for enslaving the men of another race, it is all the same old serpent."

And I quote again from Lincoln, this time from a letter to W. H. Herndon, written the 15th of February, 1848, in these words:

"The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress was dictated, as I understand, by the following reasons: Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us."

LAWTON'S DECLARATION.

So much by way of argument through the voices from the dead, unless I also add to it an argument against the Philippine policy of the present Administration in the language of the dead hero, Lawton, who said to Rev. Peter MacQueen, of West Somerville, Mass., these ever-memorable words in condemnation of the President's war: "What we want is to stop this damnable war. It is time for diplomacy, time for mutual understandings." But in addition to these voices of the dead, we have the voices of the living in condemnation of President McKinley's Philippine war, and I quote first President McKinley himself, against himself, appealing from Philip drunk to Philip sober. I mean these words from President McKinley's message sent to us as members of Congress on the 11th of April, 1898, when he said: "I speak not of forcible annexation, for that can not be thought of. That by our code of morals would be criminal."

This is the only living man from whom I shall quote who voted for William McKinley as against Bryan in 1896 who will not vote for Bryan against McKinley in 1900. This policy of militarism and forcible annexation and criminal aggression and taxation without representation has been condemned by so many of the living who supported William McKinley in 1896 and will now support William Jennings Bryan in 1900 that I can not impose upon your patience quotations except from a few.

EX-PRESIDENT HARRISON.

First I quote from the Republican ex-President Harrison, who said with reference to the change of front on the part of wabbling William from a "plain duty" as to taxation without representation of the people of Porto Rico, that "it is a departure from correct principles." This same ex-President Harrison has not yet decided whether he will make any campaign speeches this fall. It will be more to his credit and to his honor if he will remember that a man by the name of Benjamin Harrison signed the Declaration of Independence, saying that all men are created equal. It will be more to the credit of ex-President Harrison if he can not be seduced to the support of the Ohio coterie who have apologized to England for the unceremonious conduct of the Boston tea party.

GENERAL BEATTY.

I also quote from Gen. John Beatty, the Republican banker, of our own good city of Columbus, who has recently declared that "the Republican ticket nominated at Philadelphia is made up of a civil fraud for its head and a military fraud for its tail." These words are not inconsiderate words. They came from a gentleman who has reached mature and philosophical years; who was a Congressman for several years, in the days when Hayes was President, and who advocated the election of William McKinley to the Presidency in 1896, and a few days since, at the anti-imperialist convention in Indianapolis, expressed his humiliation and profound regret, begging and praying Deity to forgive him for his mistake of 1896.

General Beatty also said in a pamphlet issued on the 20th of July, 1899, that "The war which the United States is now waging in the Philippine Islands is a war of conquest and subjugation. As such it contradicts the declarations and professions of our whole history and is subversive of the very groundwork of our Government. It means a revolution not in the Philippine Islands only, but a revolution at home, which, if successful, will ultimately change this Republic into an empire."

EX-SPEAKER REED.

Ex-Speaker Thomas B. Reed has said in three words more than most men could say in three hundred when he said: "Empire can wait."

Henry U. Johnson, the ablest Republican Congressman from the State of Indiana, so completely humiliated and whipped J. P. DOLLIVER at the close of the Fifty-fifth Congress in a debate as to what the President's policy would be in the Philippines, that DOLLIVER, although offering himself as the mouthpiece of the Administration for the day, came out of the controversy looking like a drowned rat, and refusing to venture a prediction as to what William McKinley would do with the Philippines.

Capt. Patrick O'Farrell, a life-long Republican, who has made scores of speeches in behalf of the Republican party in this State, recently said at Cooper Institute, New York City: "I remember when I first saw the sacred soil of Virginia, during the great civil war—yes, the great war for liberty—I read a sign on a large brick building in Alexandria, 'Price, Birch & Co., dealers in slaves.' I remained South long enough to shoot that slavery business to death. Oh, I am awfully proud that I was an abolitionist and a Republican in those days! Those were the days of Lincoln and liberty. Now, when I walk up Pennsylvania avenue, I look up at the White House and I am carried back to the days of 'Price, Birch & Co., dealers in slaves,' and I read on that White House in imaginary lines, 'HANNA, McKinley & Co., wholesale dealers in Filipino slaves.'"

I also quote from the address of William Lloyd Garrison, at the annual meeting of the Progressive Friends, Longwood, Pa., June 10, 1899, these words: "More than all else we have weakened faith in ideals; accustomed ourselves to brutality; retrograded to slave-holding views as regards the treatment of so-called inferior races; discarded the saving and immortal essence of Lincoln's Gettysburg address, and Lowell's supreme gospel of Democracy—brotherly love, self-respect, honesty, character, decency—all these we are asked to barter for the Philippines with their inevitable train of new wars, hatreds, self-contempt, murder, and disease." Garrison also said, "Whittier's ringing question is again in order:

"Is the dollar only real? God and truth and right a dream?"

Weighed against your lying ledgers, must our manhood kick the beam?"

Time will not permit me to give quotations from Carl Schurz, ex-Governor Boutwell, of Massachusetts, ex-Senator Henderson, of Missouri, and Dr. Von Holst, of the University of Chicago, nor do I deem it necessary, for these have been given such wide currency that you are probably already familiar with them, but I hope you will indulge me while I read a few words from Justice Brewer, of the Supreme Bench of the United States, who was appointed as a Republican by President Harrison and in his Buffalo speech, before the Liberal Club, made this declaration:

"To every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood, for the good or evil side;

Truth forever on the scaffold, wrong forever on the throne,
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and, behind the dim unknown,
Standeth God with the shadow, keeping watch above His own."

JUSTICE BREWER.

And this distinguished justice of the Supreme Bench, after reciting the many problems that confront the citizenship of the American Republic, concluded his address in this language:

"With these problems resting upon and burdening the nation, is it wise to throw upon it the awful problem of dealing with millions far more incapable of and unused to self-government? Can we expect to find safety in adding to our difficulties? Can we relieve against one problem of dealing with ignorant and unfit masses here by adding millions more to the problem? This is no trifling question, and is not answered by any gush about 'duty and destiny'; in fact, all this talk about destiny is wearisome. We make our own destiny. We are not the victims, but the masters, of fate, and to attempt to unload upon the Almighty responsibility for that which we choose to do is not only an insult to Him but to ordinary human intelligence."

HON. PETER A. LAUBIE.

I next quote from Hon. Peter A. Laubie, one of the most distinguished jurists of the State of Ohio, and one of the most distinguished Republicans in our great State, a man so well known for his learning and his legal attainments that he was elected, without his seeking and without his knowledge, president of the Ohio State Bar Association a year ago, and on the 10th day of July, 1900, delivered an address to the Ohio State Bar Association with reference to the President's Philippine policy, which made the very marrow freeze in the bones of every Hannibal in the State. Great as was the speech of Justice Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court, against McKinley's policy; great as has been the arraignment of the Administration by Senator Hoar; yet no man in America has delivered an argument so pregnant with facts, so exhaustive and logical in its principles, as the speech of the Republican judge, president of the Ohio State Bar Association, from which I quote rather extensively, hoping and desiring that in one way or another I may arouse every voter in the State of Ohio and every voter in the American Republic to read the entire argument of Judge Laubie. This speech of his demonstrates that no man in the American Congress is better informed on the Philippine question than the Republican president of the Ohio State Bar Association.

I incorporate here so much of Judge Laubie's address as bears on the Administration's Philippine policy, which is as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. PETER A. LAUBIE, PRESIDENT OF THE OHIO STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, AT PUT IN BAY, OHIO, JULY 10, 1900.

Gentlemen of the Ohio State Bar Association: We are assembled at the twentieth annual meeting of this association, and in accordance with the established custom it is incumbent upon me as your honored president to deliver an address upon taking the chair, and in the performance of that duty if I shall seriously wound or offend you, I beg of you to remember that this task came to me unsought, my consent even not having been asked; that it was your act; and I repeat that if, in the performance of the task thus assigned me, you are seriously wounded in any respect, "Thou canst not say I did it; never shake thy gory locks at me."

But you have rights, and the manner in which you may exercise them can be illustrated by an incident that happened in the city of New York in January last.

The renowned Albany Society of that State held its reunion at the aristocratic Delmonico resort on the evening of the 10th of January, 1900, and Judge John Woodward, of the appellate division of the supreme court of the State of New York, undertook, at the special invitation of the society, to respond to the toast, "The Dutch in America and South Africa." As he proceeded in the delivery of his address, which was said to be a remarkably brilliant legal analysis and historical presentation of facts as to the Boers and their cause, he began a severe criticism of England's course toward that people, presuming from the character of the toast and the nationality of his hosts—the members of the society—that he was expected to state his opinions freely.

But he was not aware that they were "so English, you know," and when he reached this part of his address he was saluted with such a continuous storm of hisses and groans that he could not proceed—although one member made an appeal to the society to be generous to and hear its invited guest and speaker. It was without avail, however, and Judge Woodward apologized to the society for accepting its invitation, and left the hall.

And so, if I offend you as I proceed, you may thus assert your inalienable independent Anglo-Saxon rights if you wish to.

The only two English-speaking nations of the world—England and the United States—seem to be moving side by side for good and for evil.

Certain it is that in the last year of this marvelous century up to the present day the peace of the civilized world was broken by foreign wars only by these two English-speaking nations, who proudly boast that they are the most liberty-loving and civilized nations of the earth; each war a war of conquest, instigated and carried on from mercenary motives, for commercial expansion by one, under the guise of benevolent assimilation, and to secure the gold and diamond mines of South Africa by the other, under the false pretense of a great Dutch conspiracy against the English, which Professor Bryce, the historian and member of the British Parliament, and John Morley and other leading members of the Parliament, in public addresses, have declared was "an afterthought of the government, conjured up to mask a hideous and ghastly blunder, and to arouse the patriotism of the people over an unjust war." That in the negotiation "the only claim finally relied upon by the British Government was as to the right of the elective franchise for Englishmen in the Transvaal, and which the Transvaal Government offered, as an ultimatum, to confer upon a five-year residence." That this ultimatum was not accepted, "that the speech of Lord Salisbury of July 28,

1899, meant war; that the actual recorded course of events justified the Transvaal in believing that we (Britain) meant to strike them in their weakness, and therefore fully explains their striking first," and that there was not an Englishman in the Transvaal who would have forsown his country to become a Boer.

It would seem that Judge Woodward made a mistake, in that he attempted to deliver his address on the wrong side of the Atlantic.

If such a matter is a *casus belli*, China should be thundering at our gates these many years. We not only refuse the Chinese naturalization, but habitation as well; and if one surreptitiously lands on our shores we arrest him and send him back. Of course this gives us not only great advantage over European nations in demanding, and great right to demand, of China privileges for Americans, but it enables our missionaries to show the Chinese how much we love them, how much more liberal Christians we are than all others, and how much better it would be for them to become members of American rather than European churches.

Following out our policy as to the exclusion of the Chinese, and forbidding their naturalization, having annexed Hawaii, one-fifth of whose population are Chinese, the act of Congress making it a Territory provides that no Chinese residing in said islands shall be permitted to land in any State or other Territory of the United States.

But that which especially interests us is our own war and the conduct of our own Government in regard to the Philippines.

This is not a place where political discussion can be allowed. Here partisanship may not raise its voice. But governmental action, and legislation, national as well as State, with the reasons assigned therefor, and the means used to accomplish them, and their probable effects, are, especially in an association like this, legitimate objects of discussion, to be tested and analyzed upon legal and constitutional grounds and just and equitable principles; and disregarding politics, I shall discuss questions from the point of view of the citizen lawyer, in the light of the laws and the Constitution, justice and equity, and the principles and traditions of this Republic and international comity. And in stating facts I shall state none but those that are now conceded on all hands to be true and beyond dispute.

The question I now touch upon is one of the most, if not the most, momentous question this nation was ever called upon to face from the beginning of this century, the decision of which involves the stability of its republicanism, if not the very life of the Republic itself.

This country entered upon a war with Spain for humanity's sake to aid a people near to our shores to free themselves from the most cruel and barbarous tyranny in history, loudly declaring through our Congress and Executive that we sought and would seek no territorial aggrandizement; that forcible annexation would be "criminal aggression" under our principles of government and was not to be thought of; and this was reasserted but the other day at Philadelphia, in the Republican national platform, in these words: "No thought of national aggrandizement tarnished the high purpose with which American standards were unfurled." It is a source of gratification to me that in the declaration of principles of my party the convention adhered to the truth of current history and confined the statement to the beginning of the war.

The fact is that when the end was accomplished and that war was over this Government turned its attention to other subject peoples of Spain in the far Orient—Mohammedan Sulus and Christian Filipinos, who helped us as allies in our war against Spain to free Cuba—and trained our guns upon them and made them our subjects, and forcibly annexed their islands as tails to our American kite, and paid Spain \$20,000,000 for the privilege of doing so.

In these islands, according to Professor Worcester, there exist 84 distinct tribes, each with different laws and customs, and 69 of these tribes are pagan and uneducated—of all people in the world the least open to conversion to Christianity and democratic principles, especially the dominant race of the Sulu Archipelago, ruled over by the despotic Sultan of Sulu; the Mohammedan Moros, who believe that the killing of a Christian is a sure passport to heaven—a glorious addition, surely, to American citizenship.

Of the other fifteen tribes, the Filipinos, many of them, the Tagalogs and Visayans especially, are educated Christians—Catholics, it is true, but with church and schoolhouse in every village—not up to our standard of civilization and government, of course, but how many nations of the world are?

That the Filipinos were treated by our Army and Navy officers as an independent people and as allies, the same as the Cubans in our war against Spain, and that they were fighting Spain for their own independence and expected it under the protection of the United States, is conclusively shown by the records of our Departments at Washington, in dispatches from our consul at Manila, Oscar F. Williams, and from E. S. Pratt, our consul at Singapore, from Admiral Dewey, from Gen. T. M. Anderson, and other officers.

From these dispatches it is shown, and it is now history, that the Filipinos had Manila besieged by an army of about 10,000 men weeks before Dewey arrived with his fleet; that they had beaten and captured the Spanish forces and had established civil government in all other parts of Luzon before Manila fell; that they assisted our army and fleet, at the request of our commanding officers, and aided in the capture of Manila, and expected self-government under the protection of the United States, the same as Cuba, and were, according to the reports of our officers, far superior in intelligence and more capable of self-government than the Cubans or any of the Asiatic races. I can give here but a very limited extract from these dispatches. On June 23, 1898, Admiral Dewey wired the Secretary of the Navy: "I have given him (Aguinaldo) to understand that I consider the insurgents as friends, being opposed to common enemy. Aguinaldo has gone to attend a meeting of insurgent leaders for the purpose of forming a civil government. He has acted independent of the squadron, but has kept me advised of his progress, which has been wonderful. I have allowed him to take such arms and ammunition from the arsenal as he needed. I have advised him to conduct the war humanely, which he has done. In my opinion these people are far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the Cubans, and I am familiar with both races."

Again, on July 22, 1898, he wired: "The following is for the Secretary of War. Aguinaldo declares dictator (ship) and martial law over all the islands. The people expect independence."

Gen. Thomas M. Anderson was the first general commanding our forces at Manila, and on July 4, 1898, he sent Aguinaldo the following letter:

HEADQUARTERS FIRST BRIGADE, U. S. FORCES.

GENERAL: I have the honor to inform you that the United States of America, whose land forces I have the honor to command in this vicinity, being at war with the Kingdom of Spain, has entire sympathy and most friendly sentiments for the native people of the Philippine Islands.

For these reasons I desire to have the most amicable relations with you, and to have you and your people cooperate with us in military operations against the Spanish forces.

THOMAS M. ANDERSON, *Brigadier-General*.

SEÑOR DON EMILIO AGUINALDO,
Commanding Philippine Forces, Cavite, Luzon.

And the following proclamation of Aguinaldo of May 24, 1898, after he had an interview with Admiral Dewey, was sent to the Senate by President McKinley on April 18, 1900:

"I see the Spanish Government is unable to struggle with certain elements which constantly oppose the progress of this country, and now, since the powerful and great North American nation has come, showing a disinterested protec-

tion which will enable us to secure the liberty of this country, I come to assume command of all forces, ready to assure the attainment of our revived aspirations."

It is evident therefore that we treated the Filipinos as an independent people, friends and allies, and if we had continued to treat them as such, and as we did the Cubans, this unfortunate war in these islands would have been avoided, and the Filipinos would have been our warmest friends, and would have granted us all the rights and privileges we required in the island in return for our aid and protection against foreign aggression.

Clearly, it is contrary to the established principles of international law, as well as against justice and right, after all this, for us to deprive these people of self-government, and compel them to submit, as conquered subjects, to whatever rule we choose to govern them by, or to be shot to death if they do not. Equally is it in conflict with the pure spirit of liberty upon which this great Republic rests, its Declaration of Independence, its Constitution, and the principles for which our Revolutionary sires offered up their lives.

That the attempt to acquire those islands for this country would lead to such a war was so self-evident that General Otis took upon himself the authority to strike out of the original proclamation of the President to the Filipinos such parts as declared the intention of this Government to acquire absolute sovereignty over them before it was published; and he notified the President that to publish it intact would lead to immediate hostilities.

But the newspapers having obtained and published it with the objectional parts intact, the Filipinos obtained it, and being thus notified that they must submit or fight, as the Boers were notified by England, at once began the fight; and while it may be humane, possibly, "to do evil that good may follow"—the plea for all religious persecutions and national self-aggrandizement in all the ages—it remains indisputable that the two largest liberty-loving nations of the world were, at the close of this enlightened century of civilization, each engaged in a war of conquest, instigated and carried on solely for commercial expansion and self-aggrandizement.

On our part, according to a recent report of General MacArthur, we have, up to the latter part of May last, already killed nearly 11,000 of these people in our efforts to subdue them; and we are still shooting them by the hundred weekly.

It reminds one of the exclamation of Madame Roland as she was led to the guillotine during that carnival of crime known as the French Revolution: "Oh! Liberty! Liberty! how many crimes are committed in thy name!"

This change of policy upon the part of the Administration was upheld by its party and became a party question, and all who uttered disapproval of the war or doubts of its justness were denounced as traitors to their country and false to its flag. On the other hand, the opponents of that policy and of the Administration asserted that the Administration and its supporters were acting despotically and imperially, and were false to all the principles and traditions of our Government and the real traitors to the country, and were doing precisely what England endeavored to do to the American colonies in the Revolutionary war.

And thus this matter passed into the domain of politics, and the party bosses took it in hand, so that all partisans who blindly follow the "boss" were saved the necessity of worrying themselves into a fever in the endeavor to find out whether the Government was acting in the spirit becoming a liberty-loving people; and the blind followers of the bosses can congratulate themselves on this fortunate condition in the language of the Mexican war-time poet, Lowell:

Parson Wilber he calls all these arguments lies;
Says they're nothin' on air but just fee, law, fum;
And that all this big talk of our destinies
Is half or it ign'ance and t'other half rum;
But John P.
Robinson he
Says it ain't no sech thing; an' of course so must we.
Wall, its a marcy we've got folks to tell us
The rights an the wrongs o' the matters, I vow—
God sends country lawyers and other wise fellers
To drive the world's team when it gits in a slough;
Fer John P.
Robinson he
Says the world'll go right if he hollers out Geel!"

But for those who look upon the matter from the point of view of the lawyer or citizen zealous in upholding the laws, the Constitution, the honor, the principles, and traditions of the Republic and its founders, and whose opinions are not formed by a political boss, it presents a question far above party politics, calling for the exercise of the highest patriotism and love of country, of liberty, and devotion to republican principles.

To those the question is not whether the possession of those islands will increase our commerce; not what are Filipinos or Malays; not whether those people are capable of self-government from our standpoint. The question is not as to them, but as to ourselves, what are we doing; are we acting in accordance with justice and honor and with the principles upon which our Government was established and upon which it rests?

Are we merely seeking to confer the blessings of liberty upon those people, or are we seeking our own aggrandizement?

Let us seek the answer as patriotic American citizens should seek it, and not as political partisans.

Its solution and opposition to this imperialism does not necessarily call for a man to leave his party. The old doctrine "Stick to your party and assist in righting it when it goes wrong" is not a bad one, especially in cases like this, where the whole matter is in the hands of Congress, and by proper pressure upon it by the members of the party in power at the time the whole matter may be made right, and at the proper time self-government be granted to the Filipinos as well as to the Cubans. And it is to be remembered that the only positive declaration by Congress on this subject, as I now recall, is in the McNery resolution adopted by the Senate as declaratory of its purpose in ratifying, and to allay the opposition to, and procure the ratification of the treaty with Spain, which declares:

"That by the ratification of the pending treaty of peace with Spain it is not intended to incorporate the inhabitants of said islands into citizenship of the United States, nor is it intended to permanently annex said islands as an integral part of the territory of the United States."

Congressmen are but the servants of their party, and not its masters. We are having an illustration of that fact to-day in the complaints which the leaders of the Porto Rico legislation in Congress are making against the Republican national convention because it did not indorse that legislation in the platform of principles adopted by that convention.

The war with Spain opened a new era in the history of our country, producing conditions at war with the century—old principles and traditions of our Government, our heretofore revered Declaration of Independence and National Constitution.

It has launched us into the world's craze of colonial acquisition and dominion and into European international complications, which, if persevered in, will upset and reverse the whole policy and system upon which this Government was founded and upon which it has been thus far carried on with such marvelous success, to the astonishment and admiration of the world.

That such action will produce this result if persisted in has been demonstrated already, although we have but barely entered upon the new departure.

Disregarding the dangers of our unsolved race problems at home, we have

overwhelmed ourselves with race problems thousands of miles from our shores, far exceeding in importance, in their general scope and purpose, every other question of the day.

We have undertaken to annex and assimilate millions of alien peoples in Hawaii, Tutuila, Guam, Porto Rico, and the Philippines—black, brown, and yellow men, pagan and Christian, barbaric and semicivilized; hardly a tribe of whom has been at peace for centuries past; many of whom it took Spain two centuries to subdue, like the warlike Moros, the Mohammedans of the Sulu archipelago, who fought Spain's dominion for two centuries, maintained their religion intact, and massacred the Spanish missionaries; and who, as late as 1885, treacherously obtained admission to the capital, massacred the Spanish governor, his court, and followers, and razed the capital to the ground, because he wanted to do what former governors did not attempt—compel the Moro to submit to taxation.

These Sulus are a polygamous, slave-holding race, who are so fanatical that touch their religion and you light a firebrand that is inextinguishable.

Like Spain, we have pensioned the polygamous ruler of this warlike race and his cabinet, and in defiance of the Constitution, which declares "that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction," the Government has by treaty with that polygamous Sultan not only recognized the existence of slavery in that archipelago, but has agreed to protect it by the following article of that treaty:

"4. The United States agrees to the preservation of existing social conditions on condition that every person held in bondage or ownership under grant of the Sultan, or by individual purchase, shall be entitled to his liberty upon the payment of \$20 (American money) to the Crown."

By thus violating our National Constitution, by authorizing and protecting slavery in this part of our new possessions and paying pensions to the polygamous reigning monarch and his cabinet, we have managed so far to keep the most of this warlike race quiet.

In the most civilized portion of the Philippines, however—in the island of Luzon and adjacent islands, the largest and most important of the whole group—we have an army of 65,000 men and for the past eighteen months have been carrying on a devastating war with their barbarous inhabitants, who, in some unaccountable way, impossible of belief, have a Christian church and schoolhouse in every village and colleges in the cities, and who cry, "Give us liberty or give us death," the latter of which, at least, we have been granting them in full measure as their just due. And this "righteous judgment of God upon these barbarous wretches," as Oliver Cromwell called his massacre of the Irish at Drogheda, or "manifestation of God's will," as our noble Senators and others name it, it is assumed must continue for years to come.

It is conceded that a large standing army will be needed for years to keep these wretches in subjection, as we are compelled to garrison every town in order to hold it, and an immense and powerful fleet of war vessels will have to be kept for all time to defend these new possessions against foreign encroachments, for it is utterly impossible for a nation to pursue a policy of aggressive colonial expansion without arousing antagonisms on all sides and becoming embroiled in all sorts of international complications. Every fresh acquisition is regarded by other imperialistic nations as almost a casus belli, and the question is now interfering with the settlement by the powers of the Chinese imbroglio.

What may be the outcome of the present complications in China remains to be seen. Already a portion of the public press—a power in molding the minds and actions of our people that is irresistible—is advocating the doctrine that this country must have its full share of everything in China.

The religious fanatics are also advocating the same thing, as illustrated by the Rev. Bishop Cranston's declaration at Denver recently from the pulpit. He is reported to have said:

"It is worth any cost in money, it is worth any cost in bloodshed, if we can make the millions of Chinese true and intelligent Christians.

"I would cut all of the red tape in the world and break all the treaties ever made to place the armies of the United States in the fore, next to Great Britain. We must not be the tail end of everything.

"The open door must be maintained for Christianity as well as commerce, and the bigotry of Russia, which now shows so strongly in the events taking place in China, must not be allowed to interfere with the progress of humanity, civilization, and religion."

And Bishop Doan, of Albany, N. Y., is also reported as saying:

"I believe good to the Christian cause will be the outcome of these troubles. Whether that end will be achieved by war against all China or whether it will be preceded by a partition of the Empire I can not say. But it is certain that the spectacle of all the powers working harmoniously in the Far East in such a crisis bodes well for successful missionary work in future years."

In his recent speech to his troops, the German Emperor sounds the same fanatical note. Not content with revenge for the wrong done to Germany, he tells his troops and the world that he not only sends them to avenge a wrong, but that "the fight is the fight of civilization; it is for the defense of our religion."

Having entered upon this craze for world-wide dominion, whether we shall unite with other powers in forcing our Christianity upon China at the point of the bayonet, or join in a subdivision of China, as we did of Samoa, instead of enforcing reparation for all wrongs done to Americans, is for the future.

We are at present, at least, so far advanced toward imperialism that we must reverse our settled policy against foreign entangling alliances, and against large standing armies and war fleets, the maintenance of which in all time has been inimical to liberty and freedom in nations, and which constitutes the special mark of a despotism or a monarchy the world over, and upon which depends the very existence of such governments.

This result has been further demonstrated by the action of Congress in legislating for Porto Rico.

Upon the acquisition of Porto Rico from Spain, the inhabitants of that island submitted peaceably to our arms upon the assurance of General Miles that they would become citizens of the United States and have rights, privileges, and immunities of such citizens. But when the President recommended Congress to form a civil government for Porto Rico in accordance with "our plain duty," it became at once apparent that if the Porto Ricans were granted these rights it might bring disaster to many of our home products and the labor of this country, as it would bring their cheaply raised products and cheap labor into competition with the products and labor of our home markets—that our manufacturers, labor contractors, coal-mine operators, and others would soon be importing cheap labor from that island in competition with our home labor, as they are continually trying to do, and would do with cheap labor of Europe, if it were not that laws were passed by Congress to prevent them.

It was also foreseen that if these rights were granted to Porto Rico, it would establish a precedent that could not be overcome in favor of the Philippine Islands. If we retained them, with their 8,000,000 people, and not only that, but if the "open door" was established between the Philippines, as an integral part of the United States, and the home Government, it would of necessity, by reason of our treaty stipulations with Spain and other nations, have to be maintained for all nations for at least ten years, the time granted to Spain by that treaty. Thus our protective tariff system would be destroyed, and it has been proclaimed by leading tariff publications and advocates that "expansion is the door of protection" and the "death of labor."

And face to face with this problem arose the question: With Great Britain keeping an "open door" in all her possessions, and this country asking trade concessions of her and other nations, and insisting upon the "open door" in all protectorates and spheres of influence of Great Britain and other nations in

China, how can we keep a "closed door" in our adjoining possessions, the Philippines?

So at the very threshold of this new departure—this reaching out into the far corners of the world for new possessions and heterogeneous peoples—serious and startling difficulties and national problems arose not contemplated when these lands and peoples were bought or acquired, which if solved in favor of these peoples according to the Constitution would bring disaster and death to that system of protection against foreign competition to our home industries and labor which the advocates of that system declare made this country one of the foremost manufacturing and trading nations of the world, and who seemed to think it would strand the party that brought these disasters upon the country if they could not be overcome in some way.

Grasping the perils of the situation, the party leaders in Congress formulated new theories and rules governing the relation of territories and the citizens thereof to the Government under the new era thus created.

The Porto Rico bill brought to the front the question of the relation of the people of Porto Rico and of the Philippines to this Government; and those in charge of the bill declared that we would permanently hold and govern all of those islands; that by virtue of their assimilation into our body politic their inhabitants could not be aliens, as they belonged and owed allegiance to no other country; that they were citizens, but not entitled to all the rights of citizens; that while the Constitution covered and protected them as citizens in their persons and property, Congress had the power under the Constitution to treat the islands as foreign countries, and to levy a duty upon all articles exported from the islands into any of the States or Territories, or vice versa. Prior to the passage of the bill the Senator having it in charge in the Senate presented an amendment to it to meet these conditions. Originally as reported by him the bill provided that the inhabitants of Porto Rico shall be "citizens of the United States." The amendment changed this so as to read, "shall be deemed and held to be citizens of Porto Rico, and as such entitled to the protection of the United States;" and the Senator declared the change was made so that it could not be claimed that Porto Rico was a part of the United States or that the bill extended the Constitution over that island. The bill named that possession not as the Territory of Porto Rico, but the people of Porto Rico.

While Congress declared Hawaii, with a population composed almost exclusively of negroes, Chinese, and Japanese, to be a Territory of the United States and provided a territorial form of government for those islands, with the right of limited representation in Congress and of free entry to the States of all their products, it denied those rights to Porto Rico, and proceeded to place custom duties upon its products and merchandise when exported and imported to and from the States, and the authority of Congress to do so was based upon the following propositions:

1. That the Constitution does not of its own force apply to Territories, but only through Congressional action to that end.

2. That the Constitution expressly gave to Congress the power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting Territories, and that this power was not restricted by any limitations in that instrument.

3. That a Territory was not a part of the United States within the meaning of section 8, Article I, of the Constitution, which declares that "all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;" that that reference is to the States proper, and does not include Territories.

And as a resultant it was declared and established that Congress could hold and govern our island territories, whether acquired by treaty, annexation, or conquest, for such time and in such manner as it saw fit, without regard to constitutional restrictions or limitations, deny citizenship to the inhabitants thereof, and maintain a tariff on their exports and imports of goods and products to and from any of the States, in utter disregard of the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States, whose interpretation of the Constitution is binding upon all the other departments of the Government and its citizens, had, as early as 1820, held that the term United States, as used in such eighth section of Article I of the Constitution, included Territories and districts as well as States, and that it prohibits Congress from making any discrimination against a Territory or district in the laying of duties, imposts, and excises.

In *Loughborough vs. Blake*, 5 Wheaton, 317, C. J. Marshall, delivering the opinion of the court, said:

"The eighth section of the first article gives to Congress the 'power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises' for the purpose thereinafter mentioned. This grant is general, without limitation as to place. It consequently extends to all places over which the Government extends. If this could be doubted, the doubt is removed by the subsequent words, which modify the grant. These words are: 'But all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.'"

"The power, then, to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises may be exercised, and must be exercised, throughout the United States. Does this term designate the whole, or any particular portion of the American Empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania, and it is not less necessary, on the principles of our Constitution, that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises should be observed in the one than in the other."

The doctrine thus announced and established in this case was subsequently referred to and approved on several occasions by the same court. In addition thereto section 9, of article I, of the Constitution provides that "no tax or duty shall be paid on articles exported from any State;" and as duties must be paid upon States and Territories equally, it follows that if no duty can be imposed by Congress upon articles exported from any State, none can be imposed upon articles exported from a Territory; there can be no discrimination in such cases; and it would require unparalleled bravery from anyone to charge an intention to make so unjust a discrimination upon the framers of the Constitution.

Thus Congress, a creature of the Constitution, that can not exercise a power not granted to it by the Constitution, by virtue of a power conferred upon it by one provision of the Constitution exercises sovereignty despotically over territories and peoples in utter disregard of the limitations on that power in other parts of the same instrument, and of the interpretation put upon them by the Supreme Court of the land; and has declared as to Porto Rico and the Philippines that it can lawfully hold them as colonies or possessions as distinct from territories, or, as otherwise put, as territories that are not part of the United States, and as long as Congress sees fit to do so, and have legalized the doctrine and cry that nothing but trade follows the flag—that neither liberty nor the Constitution necessarily follows the flag—that we can hold 8,000,000 of people substantially as mere subjects—8,000,000 of people without a country, devoid of all inducements to devotion to our flag or patriotism to our Republic.

Think of it. The United States of America, this great Republic, the "Land of the free and the home of the brave;" the refuge for the down-trodden and oppressed of all nations, holding with a despotic hand outside of the pale of the Constitution millions of people as mere hewers of wood and drawers of water, stripped of the rights bestowed even upon the negroes of Hawaii.

It reminds one of the quaint but vigorous expression of that great patriot and martyr, Abraham Lincoln, who, in referring to the assertion in our Declaration of Independence that all men are created free and equal, said "it was of no practical use in effecting our separation from Great Britain; and it was placed in the Declaration not for that, but for future use. Its authors meant it to be—*as, thank God, it is now proving itself—a stumbling-block to all those who in after*

times might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism. They knew the proneness of prosperity to breed tyrants, and they meant when such should reappear in this fair land and commence their vocation they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack." Is it any wonder that millions of patriotic citizens of this nation fear the new departure has cracked that nut and sounded the death knell of republican institutions?

Thus we see the immense importance to all of us of this new era in the history of our country; the necessity that each should patriotically determine for himself the course to adopt and pursue; and especially that the lawyers and their associations, who can and do yield a potent influence in the councils of the Republic, should devote their energies to the preservation intact of the principles and the traditions of our Republic, its Constitution, and the dispensation of liberty, equality, and justice to all who come within its fold.

It was, and is, not at all necessary that we should acquire and hold these islands in order to increase our trade in that part of the world. Commercial greed in this instance overreached and deceived itself, or knowingly deceived the people, and needlessly brought upon us all these disastrous complications.

Commercial supremacy does not depend upon vast colonial or world-wide possessions; it depends upon manufacturing and commercial efficiency. Let me illustrate: England—the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland—has been the leading manufacturing and trading country of the world. She has 60 per cent of the carrying trade of the world, and by far the largest colonial empire of any nation, present or past.

In area her colonial possessions, including protectorates and so-called spheres of influence and India, amounts to 11,000,000 square miles, nearly ninety times larger than our possessions of Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the Philippines; and in population these possessions contain 420,000,000 inhabitants, or nearly one-third of the population of the whole world.

Now, if commercial supremacy depends on the extent of colonial or world-wide possessions, if trade follows the flag, then England should be mistress of the trade of the world; and the foreign trade of the United States, with not a foot of foreign possessions until now, should be, in comparison, like a mole hill to a mountain.

Yet how stand the figures?

In 1898, the year preceding the Philippine and Boer wars, the total exports of merchandise of England—the United Kingdom—was, according to the highest estimate, \$1,430,814,000. For the year ending June 30, 1898, the exports of merchandise of the United States was \$1,231,482,330, about nine-tenths of that of England, and, roughly speaking, double what they were ten years before, in 1888; while England's exports during the same period had but a trifling increase, if any.

In 1898, without a single foot, substantially, of foreign or colonial possessions, we had become the second merchandise-selling nation of the world; and so rapid has been our stride in this direction that the nations look aghast and are all straining every nerve to stop our onward march to commercial supremacy without avail, for at the present time the exports of the United States exceed those of any other nation. Indeed, taking into consideration, as we should, imports as well as exports, we were the leading commercial nation of the world before the Philippine war began.

A nation is like a merchant, the value of its trade is in its profits; and if it buys yearly more than it sells, its foreign commerce is in a bad strait; and of the four principal commercial nations the United States is the only one that sells more than it buys.

Recurring to the year 1898, the imports of Great Britain were nearly double that of her exports.

Germany's imports were one-third more than her exports.

France's imports were nearly one-fifth more than her exports; while the imports of the United States were but one-half the amount of her exports.

In reality, therefore, this country was the leading commercial nation of the world when we entered upon the craze of colonial possessions for commercial expansion—as we were also the leading manufacturing nation, to the extent of \$500,000,000 annually.

The cry, therefore, that "trade follows the flag," in order to induce this nation to buy, or to buy and conquer, foreign lands, is fallacious and shows us that foreign commerce and commercial supremacy depend upon manufacturing and commercial efficiency and not at all upon the extent of colonial possessions.

That other cry, that we should subdue, acquire, and hold the Philippines for Christian and benevolent purposes, if we have to kill them all to accomplish it, is beyond discussion.

Such a doctrine might do for the old Pharaoh days when Moses glorified the Lord as "the man of war," but it will have to comport with the teachings of the meek and lowly Saviour and with the new era born with Him of "peace on earth and good will toward men." Like the other cry, it is used simply to reconcile this liberty-loving people to forcible annexation, to the new era of "imperialism," to the idea of colonial empire, and to induce them to believe that that which is morally wrong is politically right. Indeed, the "imperialists" have been forced to abandon this cry, and they appeal now largely, if not wholly, to the greed of our people to induce them to hold the Philippines—to hold them as a pathway to the trade of China—to make our beloved flag the "greatest commercial asset in the world," as the notorious Cecil Rhodes recently described the British flag.

And beyond it all, with the war upon our hands, that which always arouses the patriotism of a people, appeals have been made so loudly, so fervently, and so continuously to the patriotism and the love of our people for their flag, by imperialistic advocates and the public press, that their sense of right and justice is for the moment clouded and lost, and millions of them are made to believe that forcible annexation, with absolute sovereignty, is constitutionally and patriotically right and just. Such appeals are always made, however cruel and unjust the war may be.

It recalls to my mind an incident of the opening of the infamous English-Chinese opium war, when in the House of Commons the great English commoner, Gladstone, in reply to similar appeals to Englishmen, said:

"How comes it to pass that the sight of that flag always raises the spirits of Englishmen? It is because it has always been associated with the cause of justice, with opposition to oppression, with respect for national right, with honorable commercial enterprise; but now, under the auspices of the noble lord, that flag is hoisted to protect an infamous contraband traffic; and if it were never to be hoisted except as it is now hoisted on the coast of China, we should recoil from the sight with horror, and should never again feel our hearts thrill, as they now thrill, with emotion when it floats proudly and magnificently on the breeze."

All history, it is said, repeats itself, and it seems now as if the history of past centuries is reenacting itself before us.

Amidst the wonderful achievements of the nineteenth century, man's moral nature—his aims, desires, ambitions, passions, individual and national—exhibit the same manifestations, seek the same ends, along the same paths, they did in all the centuries past—the same now as when the great Roman Republic sank into semibarbarism under its enormous weight of wealth, of luxury, of military-ism, of vice, and corruption.

It is criminal to shut our eyes to, or gloss over, the evils that beset us. They show us that even in this Christian, liberty-loving, and enlightened land man's moral nature has not kept pace with his intellectual, and that money is still his God.

When you touch or appeal to men's pockets you touch or appeal to that which is more tender than their conscience, and more vital than their principles.

When you confer wealth you confer life, and when you take it away it is like taking life itself, and like Shylock, the sufferer will exclaim:

"Nay, take my life and all; pardon not that;
You take my house, when you do take the prop
That doth sustain my house; you take my life,
When you do take the means whereby I live."

Sentiment weighs as nothing against business. There is no money in sentiment, but business is all money. One is the embodiment of self, the other a mere emotion; and self, as the world goes, halts at nothing; and when money jumps into the scale, sentiment, individual or national, at once kicks the beam.

The lust of wealth has become insatiable, and not only is this country the richest in the world, but we have in this democratic land of ours the richest men and corporations of any other nation. Money largely dominates all things—society, church, and state, politics, legislation, and if I must say it, sometimes even courts. It is the polestar of desire and the acme of opportunity. It is the enemy of equality and liberty in man and nations. It has destroyed republics ere now, and makes one tremble for the fate of this one.

Byron, in describing Rome, says:

"There is the moral of all human tales;
'Tis but the same rehearsal of the past;
First freedom, and then glory—when that fails,
Wealth, vice, corruption—barbarism at last."

We have passed the milestones in most of these evolutions—God grant we may never reach the last.

We flatter ourselves that we, the people of this great Republic, are better and wiser than the people of those far-gone days; that we are too wise, too good, and too strongly imbued with justice and the love of liberty and its benefits to follow in the footsteps of the republics of ancient times, and of men the world over in the ages past, and allow our liberty to be taken away and our country to lapse into semibarbarism or to become monarchical. Let us reflect a little, and consider our history for but a little more than the last half century, and see whether we are ideal republicans, with a love of liberty and democratic institutions so deeply rooted as to be unchangeable.

Many of you can remember how we despoiled Mexico of Texas at the behest of the slave States, and the Kansas and Nebraska raids for the extension of human slavery; our cruel civil war—the bloodiest in history—to dismember this Republic to establish a slave oligarchy, the righteousness of which is still upheld, and its failure regretted by millions of our people, and whose surviving soldiers—the United Society of Confederate Veterans—in the city of Louisville, but a month ago, refused to march in parade under the flag of our Union, not because of the late dogma, that nothing but trade follows the flag, but for the reason that it represents a cause they fought to destroy for four long years. Think of the treatment of our negroes in the South since that war, and the open justification of it in the House and Senate of the United States, and their almost absolute exclusion from all industrial pursuits in the North; the brutal lynchings throughout the country; the never-ending war between capital and labor, with the inhuman and despot incidents of our numerous trades-union strikes.

Think of our inordinate greed for wealth, and the growing lust for world-wide dominion and commerce; the aggregation of greater wealth in the hands of a few individuals and corporations than was ever heard of in the world's history; the arrogance and exclusiveness of that wealth; its corrupt use in the attempt to control politics, church, and state; its despot attempts through trusts to control the business and labor of the country and the widespread love of pomp and of high-sounding titles.

Think of the utter disregard of the National Constitution and the principles upon which our Government rests when they are supposed to stand in the way of partisan advantage or commercial greed; the doctrine that trade, not liberty, not the Constitution, follows the flag; the annexation of the negro-oriental islands of Hawaii at the instance of a handful of Americans who had migrated to those islands in the pursuit of the almighty dollar, with a prohibition against the removal to any other part of the United States of one-fifth of its inhabitants; the joining in a forcible protectorate over the island kingdom of Samoa with England and Germany, and the division of that kingdom by agreement with those powers between the United States and Germany, without the consent of its inhabitants—an act designated by its old King Malietoa as being as tyrannical and criminal as the dismemberment of Poland.

Think of the "wading through slaughter" to the forcible annexation of the Philippines, with millions of alien people to be held in subjection, outside of the pale of the Constitution, on the theory that it is our destiny and God's will. The pensioning of a polygamous Mohammedan sultan and his cabinet, and recognizing and permitting slavery, by treaty with him, in his part of our new possessions; the anti-liberty demand and provision for a large standing army and immense fleet of battle ships. When we consider these manifestations exhibited by this nation, all substantially in the last half century of its existence, and recall that the peculiar characteristic of its people is their heterogeneity—that one-third of the present generation are of foreign birth or of foreign parentage—that we are a mixture of all bloods and of all races—races that, having tasted of liberty and civilization, sank into and lived in barbarism during the centuries known as the "middle age," and that none of these our ancestors in any part of the world ever established and maintained a real democratic independent republic from the opening century of the Christian era until the end of the eighteenth century—eighteen centuries of Christianity without a single independent republic worthy of the name—and more especially when we recall that England, whom we so love to call "mother," whose civilization we uphold as above that of all other nations, the manners of whose nobility we ape, and whose titles we buy for our daughters, and who is now destroying the existence of the small Republics of South Africa in all the centuries of her history would have no Government but a despotism or a monarchy—when we recall and consider all these matters, and remember that in all the instances of our launching out into foreign aggression and self-aggrandizement fully one-half of our people denounced the other half as traitors because they opposed such aggressions on constitutional and patriotic grounds, is it any wonder that doubts exist as to the integrity and stability of our republican principles, and that so many of our leading citizens fear for the fate of our Republic, and wish to call a halt in our onward march to the front as a world-wide military and colonial power, and to stamp out the imperialistic doctrines so extensively advocated throughout the country?

It would seem as if the poet Holland must have had these things in view when he wrote:

"God, give us men: a time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office can not buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will—
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun crowned, who live above the fog
In public duties and in private thinking.
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land, and waiting Justice sleeps."

Can we be sure that we are so much better morally, so much more enlightened, so much more strongly attached to simple republican institutions and so much more able to withstand the love of dominion, the pride and power of militarism, the allurements of wealth, and the pomp and show of royalty, than the English and all our old world ancestors, and the republics of ancient times, whose languages, literatures, and classics we teach to our children, that we can safely launch into the imperialistic doctrines and practices that destroyed those republics, and that kept England and the world in kingly bondage for eighteen centuries of Christian civilization?

For myself, I still have confidence that the fires of liberty are not quenched, and that the American people will arise in their manhood at no distant day with a full development of their moral nature and will deliver us from all the evils that beset us as fully as our revolutionary sires delivered us from the evil of England's rule.

Let us pray that the opening of the twentieth century may furnish us with men of affairs, who will labor to preserve to us and to our posterity our cherished institutions and principles intact; and that wherever the flag floats, whether at home or in the far isles of the sea, it shall ever represent but one type of liberty for all, with no dollar-mark stamped upon its star-lit field, or its luster dimmed by greed, and that wherever raised it shall fly as the sacred emblem of liberty, equality, and self-government, "one and inseparable, now and forever."

"God of our fathers, known of old—
Lord of our far-flung battle-line—
Beneath Whose awful Hand we hold
Dominion over palm and pine—
Lord God of Hosts be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!"

JOHN SHERMAN.

One more quotation from Ohio Republicans, and I am done with voices from the living. John Sherman, in an address at a soldiers' reunion at Mansfield in August, 1899, said of the President's war against the Filipinos: "It is an unnecessary war, an uncalled-for war, and an unjust war."

These texts and quotations, I take it, will impress you that the Democrats are not alone in their charges that William McKinley has entered upon a career of conquest and empire. Great effort is being made by Republican speakers and Republican newspapers to fool the people by declaring that there is no such thing as imperialism in this country. Whether there is or not can best be determined by referring to Webster's Dictionary for the definitions of an empire and a republic.

I find in Webster's International Dictionary, issued in 1894, this definition of an empire: "Supreme power. The dominion of an emperor; the territory or countries under the jurisdiction and dominion of an emperor (rarely of a king) usually of greater extent than a kingdom, always comprising a variety in the nationality of, or the forms of administration in, constituent and subordinate portions; as the Austrian Empire. Empire carries with it the idea of a vast and complicated government."

In the same dictionary I find the following definition of a republic: "A state in which the sovereign power resides in the whole body of the people and is exercised by representatives elected by them; in some ancient states, called republics, the sovereign power was exercised by an hereditary aristocracy or a privileged few, constituting a government now distinctively called an aristocracy. In some there was a division of authority between an aristocracy and the whole body of the people except slaves. No existing republic recognizes an exclusive privilege of any class to govern or tolerates the institution of slavery."

I submit that if Webster's Dictionary is to be accepted as capable of defining a republic, then the Government dominated by MARK HANNA and William McKinley is not a republic, for we have reserved to a part of our people the exclusive right of governing a million in Porto Rico and ten millions in the Philippine Islands without their consent, and we have more than tolerated the institution of slavery because we have guaranteed in the contract with the Sultan of Sulu that slavery shall be perpetuated, unless the slaves buy their own freedom, and this, of course, suggests the inquiry as to how long a slave will have to work, receiving nothing for his services, until he shall have accumulated a sufficiency to buy his freedom.

I had hoped to quote liberally from Senator HOAR and from the Germania, the Republican newspaper of Milwaukee, and from the Westliche Post, a Republican newspaper of St. Louis, and from Dr. L. W. Habercorn, the most distinguished German Republican correspondent in the United States, but we have with us here Judge Tarvin, of Kentucky, an orator who has no superior in that great State that is famous for its oratory, and we have with us our own Hon. M. A. Daugherty, of Lancaster, who has won your applause on other occasions, and whose distinguished ability alone secures for him your repeated invitations, and I must yield to your pleasure and advantage in hearing from these gentlemen. It has been announced that as your candidate for your Representative in Congress I would open the campaign here to-day, but, my friends, I have not undertaken to do this, nor can I open the campaign in any one speech, but from time to time, a little later on, I shall discuss the trusts before you and your neighbors; also other phases of imperialism and militarism, and shall give you evidence of the most abject servility of our National Government to British influence.

In fact, the conduct of our Government has been so cringing that one might safely say that Lord Pauncefote is our Secretary of State and John Hay is his chief clerk. I shall also, in due time, expose the collusion and conspiracy of the Government at Washington in its aid and support of Great Britain in her brutal murder of the two republics in South Africa, and incidentally I may take occasion to call attention to the fact that our Bureau of Education at Washington has been in the service of the Imperial Association of Great Britain in distributing literature to warp the judgment of the educators of our Republic; and now, thanking you for your many assurances of a generous approval of my work as your public servant, I yield to those whom you will prefer to hear.

I know of no greater production against the Administration's policy as to our insular affairs than Justice Brewer's address before the Liberal Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., as published by the Anti-Imperialist League, and I add it hereto in its entirety, as follows:

THE SPANISH WAR—A PROPHECY OR AN EXCEPTION?

[By the Hon. David J. Brewer, associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States—Address before the Liberal Club, Buffalo, N. Y., February 16, 1899.]

On the 18th day of April, 1898, Congress, by an overwhelming vote, passed this resolution:

"Joint resolution for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect."

"Whereas the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating, as they have, in the destruction of a United States battleship, with 265 of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbor of

Habana, and can no longer be endured, as has been set forth by the President of the United States in his message to Congress of April 11, 1898, upon which the action of Congress was invited: Therefore,

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"First. That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent."

"Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters."

"Third. That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect."

"Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people."

"Approved April 20, 1898."

This was the official declaration by the nation of its purpose in commencing the recent war. If thereupon Spain had withdrawn its troops from Cuba and left the people of the island free to establish their own government there would have been no war. And when as the result of the conflict Spain relinquished all dominion and control of Cuba and left her people free the purpose of the war was accomplished.

It were going too far to say that the philanthropic motive of emancipating Cuba was the sole cause of the war. Other matters tended more or less directly to precipitate the collision. Cuba had been for years in a state of chronic disturbance. Its unsettled condition had seriously interfered with our commercial relations with the island and peculiarly damaged our interests. The fearful catastrophe of the destruction of the *Maine* intensified an already growing feeling. The cool, dispassionate statement of Senator PROCTOR, reciting the horrors which he had seen, more potent than all the tempestuous utterances of those jingling orators who shouted for war but never enlisted, strengthened the conviction that something ought to be done. And then the varied interests which always hope to profit either pecuniarily or in the line of military or naval glory by any war kept steadily working toward the same result.

Yet, while all these matters are to be taken into account in determining the causes of war, the fact remains that the main thought—the officially declared purpose—was the relief of an oppressed people. And that purpose ought never to be forgotten. Whether facts were distorted, cruelties exaggerated, the real conditions misrepresented, whether, indeed, the emergency had arisen which called for interference, are matters which may be disputed and debated, but it should never be forgotten that the American people believed that the emergency had arisen, that humanity demanded interference, and undertook the war to put an end to cruelty and wrong and for the emancipation of a struggling and down-trodden people.

When the war had commenced it was waged as other wars, and this country struck where it could and as hard as it could. We aimed at the solar plexus, and we hit it. The proud Castilian Corbett went down, and victory is ours.

Out of this war have sprung questions affecting the future history and policy of this country—questions condensed in that which I have selected as the title of this talk: "The war with Spain; a prophecy or an exception?" The questions which I wish to notice are two in number, and may be stated thus:

First, because we undertook the deliverance of the oppressed Cubans from the domination of Spain, are we hereafter to assume the duty of forcibly emancipating all oppressed peoples, or were the circumstances surrounding our interference in Cuban affairs such as to make that simply an exception in our history and policy?

Secondly, are we to extend our dominion by force, purchase, or otherwise over remote territory and enter upon that career of colonial expansion which has become the settled habit of the great European nations, or are we to remain content with our compact continental possessions and devote our energies to the development of our own resources and the building up of the United States of America within those limits along the lines of our past history?

The questions thus presented are vital and far-reaching. They are not to be settled dogmatically; by epithet or by denunciation; nor by saying that what has been must be, and that changed conditions bring no change in duty or policy; nor, on the other hand, that because we are powerful and can do so, it is destiny and duty that we should. Cant phrases do not change convictions or determine right, and the American people are not ruled by an epigram. Fortunately these questions are being discussed without reference to party lines, and in the most earnest, patriotic, and thoughtful manner by all.

Returning to the first question, it must be noticed that if the circumstances demanded any outside interference in the affairs of Cuba (and that they did the general consensus of opinion in this country asserted), then we were so situated that it would seem to have been our special duty to interfere; we were the near Samaritan. I know there are some who say that there is no duty of a nation as of an individual to act the part of a Samaritan; that a nation, although an aggregation of individuals, is somehow or other relieved of all obligations which rest upon an individual; that it is not only its privilege, but its duty, to be guided in all respects by selfishness; that no matter what cry of appeal may come from far or near, it is the nation's right to measure its duty not by any questions of humanity, but by the mere rule of dollars and cents. To those who entertain such views of national right and duty any interference for the mere sake of relieving an oppressed people is necessarily an exception—one to be discounted and never followed.

I do not agree with those views. A nation is, in my judgment, a great moral entity, expressing in its life the sum of all the moral obligations which rest upon its individual citizens; and so there are times in the history of every nation when humanity calls upon it to look beyond the mere matter of dollars and cents, and even at personal sacrifice to interfere in the affairs of other nations. And yet, because this national duty may sometimes arise, and when it arises should always be bravely met, it does not follow therefrom that there is a continuous obligation to be looking into the affairs of other nations to see if there are not wrongs that ought to be righted, oppressed that should be delivered, and struggling people set free. The good Samaritan did not go down on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho hunting a job, but as he journeyed on his own business came where the robbed and beaten sufferer lay.

It is not mere selfishness which declares that the primary duty of a nation is to its own people, and that their interests and well-being are not to be neglected under the illusive notion that it has a duty to pose as a great national rectifier of wrongs done by other nations. It is a wise man that successfully manages his own household, that has primary regard for the well-being of its inmates, and, although he may not selfishly ignore the condition of affairs of other households, yet he ought always to remember his primary duty and be cautious about interference in the affairs of others. Everyone knows that a man who is a busybody in other people's affairs, although animated by the best of motives, is as apt to do harm as good. He often fails to appreciate the real situation, interferes in behalf of the wrong party, or interferes when interference is a curse; and the same is true of nations.

Neither is there anything in the so-called "Monroe doctrine" which makes us sponsor for this continent. We have no supervision or control over the internal

affairs of other states; we are not their guardians. Each of them has the same right to interfere in the affairs of the United States that we have to interfere in its. That doctrine finds its expression in the message of President Monroe to Congress on December 2, 1823, which, after referring to the difference between the political system which obtains across the waters and that of this country, states the right which we claim in these words:

"We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

This means only that we are unwilling that the political system of Europe shall be extended in America. We pledge noninterference with existing colonies of European governments. We simply state that their ideas of government and colonial expansion must not be worked out on this hemisphere.

Whether this doctrine has been so far approved as to become a rule of international law is one thing; it may simply have been acquiesced in because of no suitable occasion for challenge. At best it is but an expression, not of authority over this continent, but simply of protection and defense. It is a declaration of a purpose to stand by our weaker neighbors in case of attack, and in no sense an assumption of a control over their affairs. Neither have we since that message enlarged its scope.

When Great Britain demanded reparation from Nicaragua and threatened force to compel compliance, we did not interfere. In the controversy between Venezuela and Great Britain we took no new position. The former government claimed that the latter was trying to enlarge its territory wrongfully and forcibly by taking possession of that which rightfully belonged to Venezuela. We interfered only so far as to say that Great Britain should not forcibly extend its colonial possessions; and the outcome has been an arbitration between the two nations for the purpose of settling the question of right.

But the second question is of more importance, for I think it may be safely assumed that there is in the American people such a spirit of humanity and sense of responsibility that whenever there shall arise a real emergency for interference in the name of humanity in the affairs of another nation, we shall respond with alacrity, and there is also such a general prudence and caution as will keep us from unwarranted and needless interference. And this second question is one whose solution will materially affect our destiny. Happily, the war with Spain is ended, and the results of the war determined. "Grim-visag'd war hath smooth'd its wrinkled front."

As there were some who doubted in the beginning its wisdom or necessity, so there are some who doubt whether the results will be beneficial, and whether it was wise to take the territory which the nation has taken. But the thing is accomplished, and it is no part of a patriot to stand aloof and simply denounce. Rather let him accept that which has been accomplished, and apply himself as best he may to make the things accomplished fruitful, of the least injury, and productive of the most blessing. Yet, while so doing, it is right and wise to consider what shall be the future, and whether that which has been done shall become the fixed habit and settled policy of the nation. What has been done is one thing; what shall be is another. We have taken islands separated from us by the waters of the ocean. Are we thus to continually expand? Is such a policy of expansion wise?

In criticizing this policy I shall consider only the Philippines. I take them as illustrations, because the truth is better seen by its connection with a concrete fact than through any mere general statement. And if I refer only to the arguments against the appropriation of those islands, and fail to notice the many reasons or the peculiar circumstances which induced the action of our Government, it is not because I do not appreciate the force of those reasons and circumstances, but because, as I said, I am not here to complain of that which has been done. I despise a man who simply sulks and swears. My thought is, accepting that which has been done as having been the best under the circumstances, is that to become the future policy of the nation? Is it a prophecy or an exception?

One thing which seemed to attract much attention and was claimed to justify the taking possession of distant islands is the need of coaling stations. When the question of annexing Hawaii was pending distinguished officers of both the Army and Navy appeared before committees of Congress, urging the necessity of securing a coaling station on those islands, and argued that we had better take the entire territory, which was small, and thus avoid the possibility of any other nation securing a post and base of operations contiguous to our own. Now, I do not propose to question the wisdom from a military standpoint of the advice given by those officers. I am ready to accept their statement that in case of war a coaling station there or at the Philippine Islands or elsewhere is of value.

I have had no military education; I do not know how to conduct a war. I do not edit a "yellow" journal; and so I yield unquestioning assent to the claims made by these Army and Navy gentlemen that, in case of war, coaling stations in different parts of the globe are desirable. And yet, with the incredulity and questioning spirit of a Yankee, I can not but notice that we have gotten along safely for a hundred years without any coaling stations outside of our own territory, and I want to ask how much greater victory Dewey would have won if we had had a dozen coaling stations in the far Pacific? And further, it is clear that for a coaling station territory as large as New England is not essential.

I know of but one place that needs such a large coaling station, and that is a place we all hope to eternally avoid. But, beyond that, is there not such a thing as overdoing this getting ready for war? I have noticed that a man who goes about with a chip on his shoulder is very apt to have many quarrels, but the gentleman who minds his own business is ordinarily let alone and goes through life without a fight.

Not that I believe in tamely submitting to every injury or insult, or that a nation, like an individual, does not sometimes have to assert itself, even to the extent of war.

No more sacred duty rests upon the United States than to see that every citizen is protected, wherever he may be, and to secure such protection every dollar and every man within the limits of this country should stand pledged. I care not where an American may go, whether among the savage tribes in Africa, among the semicivilized nations of Asia, or in the higher civilized nations of Europe, it should be understood that the banner we love is a guaranty of safety which no nation or individual can trifle with. It is said that the lives and property of American citizens in Turkey have been wantonly destroyed.

If that be true reparation should be demanded. And if that be refused I would introduce Dewey to the Sultan before breakfast. And if beneath the fire of his guns the grand dome of the Mosque of St. Sophia tumbles into ruins, with all the picturesque splendor that attended the falling walls of the temple of Jerusalem, I should only say, let all the world take warning and respect the Stars and Stripes. It is to the glory of this country that in its infancy it refused to pay tribute to the pirates of Algiers, and sent Decatur and others, who vanquished the pirates and compelled respect to our flag. And I care not how often, if necessary, that lesson of the sanctity of the Stars and Stripes is given.

Many plans are suggested for the disposal of the Philippines. One is to withdraw our Army and Navy and leave the inhabitants to do the best they can for

themselves; another is to continue an armed force in possession for the purpose of preserving order until such time as the inhabitants have organized and put into active operation something like a stable government; third, while leaving the control of internal affairs to the inhabitants, to establish something in the nature of a protectorate—one that will guarantee peace within and protect against invasion from without; fourth, to treat the islands as so much property and sell them for what we can get—selling to any responsible purchaser and unlikely to establish good government in the islands; fifth, to make them colonies, to be governed by the United States, thus introducing into the life of this nation the colonial system which obtains among European powers; and, sixth, to incorporate these islanders as fellow-citizens, establishing therein at first Territories with the view of subsequent admission into the Union as States.

All these plans have their advocates. The air is full of argument advocating and challenging the wisdom, legality, and constitutionality of each. I do not propose to enter into any discussion of the legality or constitutionality of any of these plans. I assume that whatever the American people determine to do in reference to these islands they will. If new laws have to be enacted or constitutions amended, all is within the power of the people, for laws and constitutions, legislators, Presidents, and judges are but the means and agents by which the American people put into execution their deliberate purpose, and whatever that people determine to do they will do, and there is no power on earth that will or can stop them. Neither do I propose to say aught for or against the advisability of either of the first four plans suggested.

The only matters I desire to consider are those involved in the last two propositions, namely, the introduction of the colonial system into this country and the holding of these islands as colonies of the United States, or, on the other hand, the incorporation of the people of those islands into our nationality as citizens thereof, either by their direct admission or through the intermediate process of Territorial organization. Each of those propositions I believe freighted with peril, and I am glad that the determination has been made to hold those questions open for deliberate consideration, and not by hasty action to do that which once done might prove to be of lasting and irretrievable injury.

And, first, of the colonial system. Confessedly it will be a departure in the history of this country—an as yet untried experiment. It is said that the Anglo-Saxon race has manifested a capacity to govern well; that we are of that race, and that therefore we could well govern those islands as colonies. India and Egypt are pointed to with pride as the achievements of our race in the way of government. I do not question the capacity of the race on either side of the waters to well and wisely govern others. I object to it because it antagonizes the principles upon which this Government was founded, which have controlled its life up to the present time, and the perfection of which has been the hope and aspiration of every true American. Those principles were expressed in the Declaration of Independence in these words:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Upon these immortal principles this Government was established, and we have again and again proclaimed to the world that they are the foundations upon which this Government rests, and have appealed to our prosperity and success as evidence of the justice of those principles. Somehow or other I still believe in the Declaration of Independence, and do not take kindly to a statement like the following in the September number of the Boston Congregationalist:

"The Rev. W. T. Perrin, one of the ablest of the Methodist clergymen of Boston, defended the annexation of Porto Rico, Hawaii, and any other Spanish possessions, holding that the people of the country are realizing the absurdity of the clause in the Declaration of Independence which says that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. * * * The logic of events has made it our duty to do so, and duty is greater than theory. Government derives its powers from God, and God alone, and the nations are responsible to Him."

This assumption of divine authority has been the cry of every despot from Louis XIV, who said "I am the state," to that madcap on the German throne, who is credited with saying "Me und Gott." But with a diviner insight and a truer reverence we have believed that government derives its powers from the governed. I glory in the fact that my father was an old-line Abolitionist, and one thing which he instilled into my youthful soul was the conviction that liberty, personal and political, is the God-given right of every individual, and I expect to live and die in that faith.

I know that a Massachusetts lawyer years ago sneered at the Declaration of Independence as a collection of glittering generalities, but it takes the audacity of a Boston preacher to say in effect that the Declaration is a lie. It is true that during the century and a quarter of our existence our conduct has not been always on the plane of our avowed principles. Very few nations, as very few individuals, live up to their high ideals, but surely this has been the ideal of our life, and we have striven to make it more and more real. The great war between the States was but an effort to make those principles more far-reaching in their application, and every step forward along our history has been toward a more perfect realization of this ideal. Now, government by force is the very antipodes of this, and to introduce government by force over any portion of the nation is to start the second quarter of the second century of our life upon principles which are the exact opposite of those upon which we have hitherto lived.

It is one thing to fail of reaching your ideal; it is an entirely different thing to deliberately turn your back upon it. It is doubtless true that government by force often secures order and peace, but order and peace are not the only purpose of government. Order reigned at Warsaw. The test of government is not in the outward mechanical display of order, but in the capacity to develop the best men, and we have lived in the faith that government by the consent of the governed develops the best men. We have not let the wise rule the ignorant, the educated the uneducated, the rich the poor, but we have appealed always to those whom Abraham Lincoln called "the plain people" as the ones on whose judgment to rely, and upon whose shoulders should rest the burden of government.

Ideas are, after all, the eternal forces. Human life and destiny are controlled by them. They may seem to-day of little significance, but around them gather material interests and to-morrow their power is disclosed.

It is a universal law that no family or nation will prosper whose foundation ideas are not harmonious and consistent. If conflicting, there is nothing more certain than that trouble will follow. Our own history furnishes a tremendous lesson in this direction. We commenced our national life declaring, as its foundation principle, that all men were created equal; that they possessed inalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But we tolerated a conflicting thought. We attempted to limit our foundation principle to white men and deny it to black. It was a compromise. It seemed a small matter. The antagonism would disappear with time. But we forgot that ideas are living forces.

William H. Seward divined the whole situation when he affirmed an "irrepressible conflict." Abraham Lincoln saw the inevitable struggle when he declared that this nation could not endure half slave and half free. And after nearly a century we paid the penalty in the awful sacrifice of the civil war.

Shall we forget the lesson of the past? Shall we say it is a trifling matter to introduce into the life of this nation, which affirms that government derives all its powers from the consent of the governed, the thought that that is true of only one race and not of all, that the consent of the governed may be recognized for one portion and one race and repudiated for another portion and another race within the same dominion?

Government by consent and government by force, no matter how well the government may be administered, are two essentially antagonistic principles. Doubtless no immediate conflict will follow. We may see a large measure of prosperity; but are we not sowing the seeds which in the days to come will grow up into a harvest of trouble for our children and our children's children?

The possibility is not changed by the unquestioned fact that the Anglo-Saxon race has the capacity for governing other races, nor by the singular prosperity which has attended England in her colonial system. In comparing the two nations it must be remembered that England's colonial system commenced when the king was one in fact as well as in name.

The consent of the governed was only a little factor in English life when she first reached out her hand to subdue and control other races. It was no more for the king to govern Canada and India than it was for him to govern England; and, while the consent of the governed has been struggling and growing in England it has not even yet become the single, dominant, controlling fact of that nation's life; so that the antagonism between the two ideas of government by consent and government by force has never, in that empire, been fully developed.

With us the case is different. We stand consecrated to the single political idea of government by the consent of the governed. To introduce into the life of the nation the other thought of government by force is, at the very outset, to precipitate a conflict which, sooner or later, must inevitably result in disaster.

Neither have we been so successful in our treatment of dependent races in the past as to justify any exalted expectations for the future. We have called the Indian tribes the wards of the nation, and our best citizens have striven from the beginning of the Government to the present time to secure to them their just rights; and with what result? The eccentric Congressman from New Hampshire is credited with the statement that the Puritans marched among the Indians with a Bible in one hand and a rifle in the other. They converted those they could with the one and disposed of the rest with the other. Helen Hunt has told the story of our dealings with these tribes in a book which she entitles *A Century of Dishonor*. Are we entirely sure that a century of dishonor in respect to savages near at home will not be followed by a millennium of dishonor in respect to those beyond the seas?

To hear some talk you would think that all the influences going out from this Christian nation to the heathen have been Christian, purifying, elevating; but the fact is that even from Puritan New England there have gone more hogheads of rum than missionaries, more gallons of whiskey than Bibles. If anyone imagines that this will be changed when we come into control of the Philippines and attempt to rule them, that thereafter only missionaries and Bibles will pass thither from America, he sadly underrates the locomotive capacity of the devil.

Again, a necessity of colonial possessions is an increase in our Regular Army, and the first increase proposed is from 30,000 to 100,000 men. It is a strange commentary that at the close of the nineteenth century the head of the most arbitrary government in the civilized world, the Czar of the Russias, is inviting the nations of the world to a decrease in their arms, while this, the freest land, is proposing an increase in its. Yet such seems to be the imperative need if we enter upon the system of colonial expansion. We have lived and prospered for one hundred and twenty-three years with a handful of regular troops.

We have preserved peace at home and have been respected abroad. Government by consent of the governed has little need of the soldier. So the world has come to believe, and so it is. Are we ready to forfeit this high position? Do we not endanger the very foundation principles of this Government when we make the blare of the bugles and the tramp of the armed battalion the music which is heard on every side and the inspiration which attracts the ambition of our youth?

Another aspect of this question is worth noticing, and that is its relation to labor. We are facing, in this country, a difficult problem. The inventive spirit of our people is multiplying with marvellous rapidity labor-saving machines. By the use of them one or two skilled laborers will do the work heretofore done by many unskilled laborers. There is, therefore, a surplus of unemployed labor. The machine is supplanting the man. We are facing the fact of an increasing amount of unemployed and unskilled labor. What shall be done? China, with its enormous population, has sought to solve it by prohibiting the machine. Is that the best solution we can offer?

It has not a few advocates in our midst. The boycott put on the Oxley Slave Company, which resulted in litigation, going up to the court of appeals, in the eighth circuit, was founded on the fact that the company introduced machines into its manufactory for doing work which had theretofore been done by hand. The complaint indorsed by the Federation of Labor against the United States superintendent of printing and engraving is of the same nature. Everywhere we hear a claim that the cleaning of streets must be done by hand labor instead of by machine. More than one labor body has protested against the employment of women. I am not here to indorse all these, but simply to note the fact that labor realizes that it has a surplus, and is seeking to reduce it.

Now, the great economic problem in this country is not how can a few men make more money and pile up larger fortunes, but how can the great body of the people make a fair and comfortable living? The right to work is again and again insisted upon as more important than the right to vote, and the cry of the right to work is supplemented by the cry that the State furnish work to all who can not obtain it elsewhere. But the furnishing of work by the State means more taxation, and that implies added burdens on the employed to furnish support and sustenance to the unemployed.

The problem is a serious one. We have 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 of unskilled colored laborers south of Mason and Dixon's line, and we find the governor of a great Northern State threatening to stand at its borders with Gatling guns and shoot down those laborers if they attempt to enter to compete with its white laborers, and this in face of the constitutional provision that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the separate States." Are we likely to aid in solving this problem by bringing into our national life 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 of unskilled Malay laborers? We have shut the doors against the Chinese. Are they any worse than the Malay? Shall we introduce in this nation more cheap labor?

For labor is cheap where the cost of living is cheap, and the Malay needs but a little rice within his body and a little cotton cloth outside, and a very little rice and a very little cloth is sufficient. I do not wonder at the action of the Federation of Labor in protesting against a new competition of cheap labor, as well as an increase of the Army, with its consequent increase of burden and taxation on the employed laborer.

There is a frequent expression of the thought that this proposed expansion will fill the mind of the nation with new problems and new questions, and therefore turn its attention away from the problems and troubles which now embarrass us.

I concede it; and if turning attention away from these interior problems would solve them it were well, but I am sure it will not bring solution. Giving liquor to a man may for the time being cause him to forget his troubles, but it does not end them, and when the period of intoxication is over the troubles reappear, and generally with added force. We can not escape these difficult problems of our internal life by looking out on the distant world. They are here and must be met and solved by patient, faithful, earnest attention. We can not get away from them. We must overcome them. We may postpone, but we only add to the difficulties thereby.

But there is money in it; and, after all, this is really the most potent factor in the proposed reaching out after the islands of the Orient. The wealth of Ormus and of Ind is to-day, as in the days of Milton, the expectation and the dream of many. Possession of the Orient, with its accumulated wealth of centuries, dazzles the imagination and confuses the judgment. The haze of mystery hangs

over that vast domain. Wealth untold is believed to be there, ready to be appropriated by any dominant power. All the nations and tribes come within Lord Salisbury's definition of dying nations, and must soon be divided between and appropriated by the living and growing nations.

China is held out as a dying nation, filled with inexhaustible wealth, and why should not we share in its appropriation? What a picture this is—the eagle of liberty standing like a buzzard to grow fat over an expected corpse? When a Washington doctor of divinity the other day in conversation with the Chinese minister, in reference to the possession taken by Germany of part of her territory, said that it seemed to him that Russia and England were likely to follow the same example and appropriate some Chinese territory, the sarcastic reply was, "Yes, that is the way Christian nations do."

This matter of wealth has two sides to it. The poet says:

"'Til fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

It is not true that a mere increase of wealth foreshadows ruin and decay. It is not the possession of riches, but the way in which they are accumulated that makes the menace. We have exported from this country in the last year \$1,200,000,000 worth of our products. They were the fruit of our toil of hand and brain; and the increased wealth which flows into the land as a reward for such toil carries with it no menace, but the wealth which comes without an equivalent in toil of hand or brain is the wealth which threatens.

Who is injured by money? Not the one that earns it day by day, dollar by dollar, and saves until he accumulates a fortune, but he who by the chance discovery of a mine, or an accidental speculation in stocks, finds himself changed from poverty to sudden wealth; and that which is true of the individual is true of the nation. Whatever it accumulates by honest toil is not a curse. Whatever it obtains without giving value may be fruitful of injury. Exchanging bright-colored but cheap calicoes for furs and jewels may rapidly pile up wealth, but such wealth is more apt to curse than to bless.

This idea of the nation going into the midst of races and people where things of value have been heaped up during the centuries, and are possessed by those ignorant of their value, and appropriating those things, either by force or in exchange for cheap trinkets and gewgaws, is one filled with danger. The Cæsars saw the spears of their victorious legions flash in the sunlight of every known land, and in their triumphant return they brought with them the accumulated wealth of all the nations they had subdued. The splendor of imperial Rome outshone the world, but the wealth thus obtained without value given undermined the empire, and the glory of Rome is simply a memory.

Napoleon beheld the shining star of destiny; and then, does human nature change through the centuries? We stand to-day facing the temptation which comes from the possibility of rapidly accumulated wealth. What right have we to anticipate that the same result will not follow if we pursue the same course of taking what we have not fully earned?

Again, this reaching out to the Orient is an implied repudiation of the Monroe doctrine, and exposes to additional perils and complications and possible wars with European nations. The scope of that doctrine I have already indicated. We have shouted ourselves hoarse in its praise, and declared our willingness to fight in vindication of its principles if necessary.

It declares that we oppose any interference by European nations with States on this continent, any appropriation here of additional territory by those nations; in other words, we practically said that the powers of the Eastern Hemisphere must keep off the Western; that in this continent the problem of government of and by and for the people was being worked out, and that any attempt by European nations to take territory and thus introduce or perpetuate European ideas of government here must be resisted; and this declaration, it must be borne in mind, was not simply in reference to the States of this Union, but to all the States and nations on this continent.

When we thus formally and positively assert that the Eastern nations must keep hands off from this continent, there is an implied promise that we will keep our hands off from the other. It would be absurd to suppose that either this country or other nations understood that declaration to mean you must not come on to this continent and take any possessions, but we may come on to your continent and do as we please. The independence of one was a guaranty of the independence of the other. Now, entering the Orient to possess it is a repudiation of that doctrine, for the moment we enter there and appropriate territory that moment it ceases to become us to insist that European nations shall keep off from this continent.

We can not either rightfully or successfully pose as a supreme dictator of the world. If we ask other nations to respect the separation of this continent, we most also respect the separation of that. Indeed, the forcible taking possession by us of islands in the West Indies or portions of South America, while not inconsistent with the Monroe doctrine, seems a good deal like a slur upon it. When we insist that the problem of government by the people must have free course on this continent, it seems hardly consistent to say that no European nation shall infringe upon that proposition, but we may. Not only will the fact of a departure from the principles of the Monroe doctrine provoke challenge on the part of European nations, but the possession of outlying territories will add to our complications with such nations.

It is a matter of common knowledge that European nations are constantly in trouble between themselves by reason of differences and collisions arising between their respective colonies. England and France, England and Russia have been again and again on the point of war growing out of such troubles. We shall enter upon the same embarrassment and be exposed to all the complications and dangers attending.

Neither is the incorporation of these millions of ignorant Malays into our national life as fellow citizens, even through the probationary stage of territorial existence, freighted with less of danger. The problem we have sought to work out in this nation is that of government of and by and for the people. A great nation upon that principle seems possible only under a Federal system, a system which regulates all matter of local interest to the several States, and exercises through the National Government only those powers and functions which make for the general welfare. We have wonderfully prospered in administering such system in a compact continental territory, each part of which has been possessed and controlled by a race capable of self-government.

Imagine for one moment the outcome, if in this compact continental territory all local as well as national affairs were determined and administered in the one national Capitol at Washington. Ignorance of local needs would inevitably be followed by the invasion of a lobby representing those needs, and Washington, which even now is shadowed by the presence of enormous and conflicting national interests seeking to influence and control Congress, would be turned into one vast, monumental lobby camp.

The safety of government by the people has been in local self-government. The town meeting has perpetuated the Republic. Thus far the various States entering this Federal system have been dominated by a race capable of self-government. Introduce into that system to-morrow a multitude of States whose people are confessedly incapable of self-government and you will bury it beneath the burden of local incapacity. A chain is no stronger than its weakest link, and a Federal system, some of whose links are composed of States incapable of self-control will, unless all the laws of human action are reversed, break in pieces through the weakness of the incapable links.

We have had Territories and kept them in a state of tutelage, but that status was continued, not until the residents thereof became capable of self-government, but until the number of the population was sufficient to justify assuming the

burdens of statehood. Territorial organizations, probationary as they are, for races incapable of self-government not only repudiate the basic thought of the national life, but remain a constant and increasing menace to its successful accomplishment. Who can tell how many centuries must pass before the savage and semicivilized races of these islands become fit to assume the responsibilities of self-government? Is this Territorial period to be permanent? Who shall say how soon the necessities of politics will transform a Territory into a State? And when once brought into the Union we have links in the federal system so weak that a very little strain will snap them.

In the Union as it stands we have elements of no slight danger. We have welcomed the emigrant from all parts of the world, and in cities of the North we have an enormous population of the lowest orders of European life unacquainted with and unfit for self-government, and a great problem is how to bring these unfit masses into a helpful addition to American life. In the South we have the rapidly increasing colored population, brought here as slaves, emancipated through the most awful drain of life and money, elevated in ignorance to citizenship, and every State south of Mason and Dixon's line to-day trembles before the unsolved question of preserving intelligent self-government and at the same time guaranteeing rights of citizenship to an ignorant mass.

With these problems resting upon and burdening the nation is it wise to throw upon it the awful problem of dealing with millions far more incapable of and unused to self-government? Can we expect to find safety in adding to our difficulties? Can we relieve against one problem of dealing with ignorant and unfit masses here by adding millions more to the problem? This is no trifling question and is not answered by any gush about duty and destiny; in fact, all this talk about destiny is wearisome. We make our own destiny. We are not the victims, but the masters, of fate, and to attempt to unload upon the Almighty responsibility for that which we choose to do is not only an insult to Him, but to ordinary human intelligence.

We are told we have become so great and powerful that the world needs us, but what the world most needs is not the touch of our power, but the blessings of our example. It needs the bright example of a free people not disturbed by any illusions of territorial acquisition, of pecuniary gain, or military glory, but content with their possessions and striving through all the abilities, activities, and industries of their wisest and most earnest to make the life of each individual citizen happier, better, and more content.

My friends, two visions rise before me: One of a nation growing in population, riches, and strength; reaching out the strong hand to bring within its dominion weaker and distant races and lands; holding them by force for the rapid wealth they may bring—with perhaps the occasional glory, success, and sacrifice of war; a wondrously luxurious life into which the fortunate few shall enter: an accumulation of magnificence which for a term will charm and dazzle, and then the shadow of the awful question whether human nature has changed, and the old law, that history repeats itself, has lost its force, whether the ascending splendor of imperial power is to be followed by the descending gloom of luxury, decay, and ruin.

The other of a nation where the spirit of the Pilgrim and the Huguenot remains the living and controlling force, affirming that the Declaration of Independence, the farewell address of the Father of his Country, and the Monroe doctrine shall never pass into innocuous desuetude; devoting its energies to the development of the inexhaustible resources of its great continental territory; solving the problem of universal, personal, and political liberty of a government by the consent of the governed, where no king, no class, and no race rules, but each individual has equal voice and power in the control of all, where wealth comes only as the compensation for honest toil of hand or brain, where public service is private duty; a nation whose supreme value to the world lies not in its power, but in its unflinching loyalty to the high ideals of its youth, its forever lifting its strong hand, not to govern, but only to protect the weak; and thus the bright shining which brightens more and more into the fadeless eternal day.

Brethren, Ebal and Gerizim are before us. Might and right stand on either side with their great appeals.

"To every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood, for the good or evil side;
Careless seems the great Avenger; history's pages but record
One death grapple in the darkness 'twixt old systems and the Word;
Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne,
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above His own.

"We see dimly in the present what is small and what is great,
Slow of faith how weak an arm may turn the iron helm of fate,
But the soul is still oracular; and amid the market's din,
List the ominous stern whisper from the Delphic cave within,
'They enslave their children's children who make compromise with sin.'"

Paraphrasing in part the invocation which attends the opening of the Supreme Court, God save the United States of America and keep them from the road so often traveled by nations, of increasing territory, accumulating dominion, rapidly and easily acquired wealth, luxurious splendor, a growing separation between the poor and the rich, presaging decay and death; and may we always hear the solemn prayer of Abraham Lincoln, borne upward to Heaven from the consecrated field of Gettysburg upon the mighty volume of patriotic incense which ever rises from that sacred spot, that Government of and by and for the people may never perish from the earth!

"God of our fathers, known of old,
Lord of our far-flung battle line,
Beneath whose awful hand we hold
Dominion over palm and pine—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

"Far-called our navies melt away,
On dune and headlands sinks the fire;
Lo! all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!
Judge of the Nations, spare us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

"If, drunk with sight of power, we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe—
Such boasting as the Gentiles use,
Or lesser breeds without the Law—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!"

I shall not include herein ex-President Harrison's speech before the students of the University of Michigan nor his article in the January North American Review against the imperialism of McKinley, but I do add so much of the Mark Twain criticism of imperialism as is copied from the North American Review by the Columbus Citizen, as follows:

[From the Columbus Citizen, February 4, 1901.]

MARK TWAIN'S SARCASTIC USED WITH TELLING EFFECT IN DISCUSSING THE POLICY OF IMPERIALISM.

In the North American Review for February Mark Twain writes with merciless sarcasm "To the person sitting in darkness."

The humorist aims straight at President McKinley and the imperialistic policy. He bitterly reproaches the administration for dealing in counterfeit promises. He writes:

"And by and by comes America, and our master of the game plays it badly—plays it as Mr. Chamberlain was playing it in South Africa. It was a mistake to do that; also it was one which was quite unlooked for in a master who was playing it so well in Cuba. In Cuba he was playing the usual and regular American game, and it was winning, for there is no way to beat it. The master, contemplating Cuba, said: 'Here is an oppressed and friendless little nation which is willing to fight to be free; we go partners, and put up the strength of 70,000,000 sympathizers and the resources of the United States.'

TWAIN'S FINE SARCASTIC.

"Nothing but Europe combined could call that hand; and Europe can not combine on anything. There, in Cuba, he was following our great traditions in a way which made us very proud of him, and proud of the deep dissatisfaction which his play was provoking in continental Europe. Moved by a high inspiration, he threw out those stirring words which proclaimed that forcible annexation would be 'criminal aggression;' and in that utterance fired another 'shot heard around the world.' The memory of that fine saying will be outlived by the remembrance of no act of his but one—that he forgot it within the twelvemonth, and its honorable gospel along with it.

"For, presently, there came the Philippine temptation. It was strong; it was too strong, and he made that bad mistake; he played the European game, the Chamberlain game. It was a pity; it was a great pity, that error; that one grievous error, that irrevocable error. For it was the very place and time to play the American game again. And at no cost. Rich winnings to be gathered in, too; rich and permanent, indestructible, a fortune transmissible forever to the children of the flag.

GAME IN OUR HANDS.

"Not land, not money, not dominion—no; something worth many times more than that dross; our share, the spectacle of a nation of long harassed and persecuted slaves set free through our influence; our posterity's share, the golden memory of that fair deed.

"The game was in our hands. If it had been played according to the American rules * * * Dewey could have gone about his affairs elsewhere and left the competent Filipino army to starve out the little Spanish garrison and send it home and the Filipino citizens to set up the form of government they might prefer and deal with the friars and their doubtful acquisitions according to Filipino ideas of fairness and justice, ideas which have since been tested and found to be as high an order as any that prevail in Europe or America.

"But we played the Chamberlain game and lost the chance to add another Cuba and another honorable deed to our good record.

"The more we examine the mistake, the more clearly we perceive that it is going to be bad for the business. The person sitting in darkness is almost sure to say:

"There is something curious about this—curious and unaccountable. There must be two Americas, one that sets the captive free and one that takes a once captive's new freedom away from him, and picks a quarrel with him with nothing to found it on; then kills him to get his land."

LIVES IN A GOOD CAUSE.

"The truth is, the person sitting in darkness is saying things like that; and for the sake of the business we must persuade him to look at the Philippine matter in another and healthier way. We must arrange his opinions for him. * * * We should say to him:

"They look doubtful, but in reality they are not. There have been lies; yes, but they were told in a good cause. We have been treacherous; but that was only in order that real good might come out of apparent evil. True, we have crushed a deceived and confiding people; we have turned against the weak and friendless who trusted us; we have stamped out a just and intelligent and well-ordered republic; we have stabbed an ally in the back and slapped the face of a guest; we have bought a shadow from an enemy that hadn't it to sell; we have robbed a trusting friend of his land and his liberty; we have invited our clean young men to shoulder a discredited musket, and do bandits' work under a flag which bandits have been accustomed to fear, not to follow; we have debauched America's honor and blackened her face before the world, but each detail was for the best. We know this.

"The head of every state and sovereignty in Christendom, and 90 per cent of every legislative body in Christendom, including our Congress and our 50 State legislatures, are members not only of the church but also of the blessings of civilization trust. This world-girding accumulation of trained morals, high principles, and justice can not do an unright thing, an unfair thing, an ungenerous thing, an unclean thing. It knows what it is about. Give yourself no uneasiness, it is all right."

"Now, then, that will convince the person. You will see. It will restore the business. Also it will elect the master of the game to the vacant place in the trinity of our national gods, and there on their high thrones the three will sit age after age in the people's sight, each bearing the emblem of his service: Washington, the sword of the liberator; Lincoln, the slave's broken chains; the master, the chains repaired.

"It will give the business a splendid new start. You will see.

"A GROTESQUE UNIFORM."

"Everything is prosperous now. Everything is just as we should wish it. We have got the archipelago, and we shall never give it up. Also, we have every reason to hope that we shall have an opportunity before long to slip out of our Congressional contract with Cuba and give her something better in the place of it. It is a rich country, and many of us are already beginning to see that the contract was a sentimental mistake. But now—right now—is the best time to do some profitable rehabilitating work—work that will set us up and make us comfortable and discourage gossip.

"We can not conceal from ourselves that privately we are a little troubled about our uniform. It is one of our prides; it is acquainted with honor; it is familiar with great deeds and noble; we love it, we revere it, and so this errand it is on makes us uneasy.

"And our flag—another pride of ours, our chiefest! We have worshiped it so, and when we have seen it in far lands—glimpsing it unexpectedly in that strange sky, waving its welcome and benediction to us—we have caught our breath, and uncovered our heads, and couldn't speak for a moment for the thought of what it was to us and the great ideals it stood for. Indeed, we must do something about these things; we must not have the flag out there and the uniform. They are not needed there; we can manage in some other way.

"England manages, as regards the uniform, and so can we. We have to send soldiers—we can't get out of that—but we can disguise them. It is the way England does in South Africa. Even Mr. Chamberlain himself takes pride in England's honorable uniform, and makes the army down there wear an ugly and odious and appropriate disguise of yellow stuff, such as quarantine flags are made of, and which are hoisted to warn the healthy away from unclean disease and repulsive death. This cloth is called khaki. We could adopt it. It is light, comfortable, grotesque, and deceives the enemy, for he can not conceive of a soldier being concealed in it.

"And as for a flag for the Philippine province, it is easily managed. We can have a special one—our States do it; we can have just our usual flag, with the white stripes painted black and the stars replaced by the skull and crossbones.

"And we do not need that civil commission out there. Having no powers, it has to invent them, and that kind of work can not be effectively done by just anybody. An expert is required. Mr. Croker can be spared. We do not want the United States represented there, but only the game.

"By help of these suggested amendments progress and civilization in that country can have a boom, and it will take in the persons who are sitting in darkness, and we can resume business at the old stand."

I have just received from Willis J. Abbot a clipping from the Chicago Public, edited by Louis F. Post, the well-known single-taxer, and I incorporate the comment of Mr. Post, which is as follows:

JOHN J. LENTZ rendered a needed service Wednesday on the floor of Congress. The occasion was the discussion of a proposition to pay not more than \$50 each for the capture of Army deserters. Mr. LENTZ took advantage of the opportunity to direct the attention of the House to the reports of barbarities perpetrated by American troops upon the Filipinos, which, he said, had so disgusted soldiers with humane sentiments as to account for their desertion. With reference to these barbarities, he added: "If that is the sort of civilization that is being carried into the Philippines, it would take \$5,000 to prevent our soldiers from deserting."

The reply of the Imperialists in the House was characteristic. Their spokesman was Congressman CANNON, of Illinois, a bellicose patriot, who is ever ready to make sanguinary sacrifices upon the altar of his country with other people's blood. Mr. CANNON made no attempt to refute LENTZ's charges of barbarity. He asked for no investigation into their truth. What he did was to call LENTZ a traitor for making the charges. "You're a parallelogram," said Dr. Johnson to the fishwife. The exact words of Mr. CANNON were:

"Protected by his position in the American Congress, the gentleman from Ohio has uttered words which, if he had uttered as an American citizen in the Philippine Islands, he would have been subject to drumhead court-martial and sentenced to be shot, and properly so."

At that the Imperialist members in the House applauded vociferously. But what better confirmation of his charges could LENTZ have desired? If an American in the Philippines can expose barbarous practices upon the natives by our troops only at the risk of drumhead court-martial and military execution, though there is no legal war in progress, then it is high time that all Congressmen who are patriots by some better token than the button they wear take advantage of the privileges of their position to denounce the startling advances that imperial militarism is making.

And now, in closing, I beg of my political opponents that they spare me from a burning at the stake because of my opposition to the greed of commercialism and my contempt for the flunkies who favor imperialism; and I hope they will continue to "roast" me on the floor of the House and in their partisan press until they are so far enlightened and liberated from their political bigotry that they will be content not to court-martial me nor shoot me unless they also shoot at the same time ex-President Harrison, ex-Speaker Reed, Judge Laubie, Justice Brewer, ex-Governor Boutwell, Carl Schurz, Senator Hoar, Congressman BROWN, ex-Congressman Johnson of Indiana, and thousands of others who still claim the American right of free speech, and reserve the privilege of asking "Upon what meat doth this McKinley Caesar feed, that he hath grown so great?" as to make the Equality, Honesty, and Liberty of Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln dwindle into playthings when compared with the commercialism and imperialism of the trustocracy of to-day?

My oath of office is just as solemn and binding upon me as was that of McKinley when he voted for free coinage or when he allowed the tariff robbers to frame a bill to suit their special interests. My oath was taken to support the same Constitution which he is sworn to support. The difference between us is that what was "criminal" yesterday to him is "benevolent" to-day, while that which was criminal in my judgment yesterday is still criminal to-day; that which he recognized as his "plain duty" yesterday he refuses to do to-day, while that which was my "plain duty" yesterday is still my "plain duty" to-day. The Ten Commandments of yesterday should be the Ten Commandments of to-day in politics as well as in religion.

Contain yourselves, gentlemen, and let me admonish you in the motto of the Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln League, that "Truth loses battles, but wins wars—Truth lost a battle at Bunker Hill, but won a war at Yorktown." If Job were addressing you, he would wither you with his sarcasm, saying: "Doubtless ye are the people, and wisdom will die with you." Let me remind you that "He laughs best who laughs last," and now, my potent seniors, let me make my farewell address, recommending to you the philosophy, the religion, and the politics of Leigh Hunt's Abou Ben Adhem:

Abou Ben Adhem (may his tribe increase!)
Awoke one night from a deep dream of peace,
And saw, within the moonlight in his room,
Making it rich and like a lily in bloom,
An angel, writing in a book of gold,
Exceeding peace had made Ben Adhem bold,
And to the presence in the room he said,
"What writest thou?" The vision raised its head
And with a look made of all sweet accord
Answered, "The names of those who love the Lord."
"And is mine one?" said Abou. "Nay, not so,"
Replied the angel. Abou spake more low,
But cheerily still, and said, "I pray thee, then,
Write me as one who loves his fellow-men."
The angel wrote and vanished. The next night
It came again, a great awakening light,
And showed the names whom love of God had blessed,
And, lo! Ben Adhem's name led all the rest.

All Men Are Born Free and Equal.

An injury to the least of us should be the concern of all of us.
Whatsoever ye would that others should do unto you, do ye even so unto them.

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. LENTZ,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 20, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 14236) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes—

Mr. LENTZ said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I move to strike out the last word. I notice in this paragraph a provision offering \$50 for the apprehension of deserters. I suppose that that is an increase and is intended for deserters who are in the Philippine Islands. It must be intended for that, because we certainly would not have an increased allowance for apprehending deserters in this country. And if it be true that in our warfare with the Spaniards and with other peoples there is only one person killed for four or five wounded, and if it be true, as some of the reports indicate, that in our skirmishes with the Filipinos we kill four or five times as many as we wound, it must be apparent to everyone here that the letters that are coming home from some of the boys in the field are true when they say that they kill these men after they take them prisoners.

I know of one letter in which a young man writes home and says that they took one of the Filipinos and buried him alive, leaving simply the head extending above the surface of the earth, and then they amused themselves by cutting the head off. If that is civilization in the Philippine Islands, I wonder that we do not have to offer \$5,000 to prevent desertion, because we have many a manly boy there who ought to desert if we are giving such warfare as that to the Filipinos.

Mr. THROPP. Will the gentleman from Ohio answer a question? Have you not got the facts in that case just reversed? The account I saw of that incident was that the Filipinos had taken one of our soldiers and buried him alive, and then put food near enough to him so that he could see it but could not reach it, and had left him to starve.

Mr. LENTZ. No; you did not see any account of the case I refer to, because it is not in the public prints. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. THROPP. The account I saw was in the public prints.

Mr. LENTZ. Not the one to which I refer, because the young man is afraid to have it known that he is the author of the letter, although the facts are stated in a letter to his father. He knows very well that he would be subjected to additional risks and indignities there, so that he can not afford to have his authorship of the letter known.

Mr. STEELE. That is the reason you keep it private, I suppose.

Mr. LENTZ. So that the case I have in mind is not the case the gentleman read about.

Mr. GRAHAM. I rise to a point of order. The gentleman is not discussing the question.

Mr. LENTZ. I am discussing the question. I say that if we are going to carry on this kind of savagery instead of carrying on civilized warfare, \$50 for the apprehension of deserters is not enough, and these boys are justified in deserting, and they will go on deserting and you will have to offer a higher reward. This appropriation is not large enough under circumstances such as are being reported from the Philippine Islands, and the desertions will increase; and if you propose deliberately to go on with this kind of war you will have to pay a larger reward to prevent the boys all from deserting in the face of such barbarous customs as these.

Mr. GRAHAM. I defy the gentleman to produce such a letter as he says he has. Let him produce the letter. I think the letter originated in his own imagination.

Mr. LENTZ. Well, I do not care to discuss that. I do not yield my time to the gentleman. You can think and believe what you please. There are Republicans on the floor of this House who have evidence of the fact that there are brutalities being perpetrated there, and there are plenty of us who dare not reveal the names of the men who write these letters home telling what they are compelled to do as soldiers in the Philippine Islands. You may contradict me if you wish, but I prefer the word of the boys in the Philippine Islands before the argument or inference of any member of this House.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LENTZ. I desire to send this to the Clerk to be read.

Mr. CANNON. I ask the Clerk to read.

Mr. LENTZ. I am asking the Clerk to read. I move to strike out this whole paragraph, and I ask that that be read in connection with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that time for debate on the gentleman's motion to strike out the last word is exhausted.

Mr. LENTZ. I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. LENTZ. And in my time I ask the Clerk to read that clipping from the Cincinnati Enquirer of the 14th of February.

Mr. MAHON. I object.

Mr. LENTZ. It is in connection with that paragraph—

The CHAIRMAN. It is to be read in the gentleman's time.

Mr. MAHON. I object. Let him read it himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects.

Mr. MAHON. Let him read it in his time.

Mr. LENTZ. I am asking the Clerk to read it in my time.

Mr. MAHON. You can not do it under the rules of the House if objection is made.

Mr. LENTZ. I can read it myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection being made, the gentleman may read it.

Mr. LENTZ. I do not want the objection counted out of my time. I will read it:

ORDERS GIVEN TO THE SOLDIERS IN THE PHILIPPINES TO SHOOT EVERY MAN IN SIGHT.

[Special dispatch to the Enquirer.]

FRANKFORT, IND., February 14, 1901.

David Burus, of Rossville, has received a letter from his son, Oscar O. Burus, a private in Company I, Thirty-eighth United States Volunteers, now at Patalon, Iloilo, P. I., written under date of January 3, in which he makes the following sensational statement:

"The orders that we have are something terrible. We left Jaro on the 6th of this month, and after we were out of that town about 4 miles we had orders to kill every man and beast that we saw. This continued till yesterday, when we reached a little town near here. Say, it was something fierce to see a man out at work and just pull up and shoot him; but that was our orders, and we had to do. Don't think that I call it a pleasure, but we try to be as light-hearted as possible. I hope that this campaign will soon be over."

I also offer an extract made by myself from a letter written in the early part of January by a son to his father. The extract, without a change or omission of a word, is as follows:

The insurgents have lost all hopes of freedom since McKinley was elected. A place called Gupan had an outbreak last night. They fought for two hours. It came high being a hand-to-hand fight. The insurgents got in the town before the soldiers knew it. There were seven soldiers killed and five very badly wounded. It is only three miles from here. The scouts and a troop of cavalry was sent to reinforce the troops in that town, and I had to go with the scouts. We killed thirty-five insurgents and captured ten prisoners, which we hung them all at daylight this morning to a big mango tree, and then we burned the town to the ground and we learnt them a lesson that they won't forget. We have orders not to take any more prisoners, but to kill every man that has a gun.

Talk about your drumhead court-martial, if you please.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LENTZ. I can not yield now. I have only five minutes. I answer, sir, that I do not propose to be browbeaten nor deterred by any slurs about courts-martial. If these men are ordered to shoot every man and beast, if they are shooting men whom they find at work in the fields, it is so infernally infamous that this Congress, collectively, ought to be ashamed to face the world. Talk to me about a drumhead court-martial! Talk to me about teaching these people in the Philippine Islands Christian civilization; talk about benevolent assimilation. Ah, there never was a barbarian brute on the face of the earth equal to such cowardice as that. Talk to me about drumhead court-martial when we are guilty of murder. Do you suppose that the law of murder is simply against one man killing another? Is it not as cowardly and murderous for ten men to kill one? Is it not murder for a hundred men to kill one?

Is it not murder for 76,000,000 people to go out into the fields of eight or ten million people and murder them because we say we have the power, and that we are doing this because we must be a world power. You have answered me long enough with abuse. I am standing here arguing and pleading for Christian civilization, and not for barbarous brutality. I am asking that this House shall make no appropriation for apprehending deserters from such warfare as that. I am asking that this Congress say something about how the war shall be conducted under the Stars and Stripes, that came into being because of the divine right of "all men to be free and equal." You talk about governing by consent of the governed, and all the while are shooting men at work in the fields. This is a newspaper account, I admit; but I know of letters from sons, received by their parents, confirming worse things than this, if anything worse can be perpetrated. It is time for the country to know some of these things from some other source than a censored press. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I think I am entitled to recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LENTZ. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] that his glib talk about copperheads does not reach me. I am a Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln Democrat. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I happen to know that Abraham Lincoln never sent a Taft commission to any island to form a government to legislate for them, appoint judicial officers and tax collectors, in violation of the Declaration of Independence of the United States upon which the war of the Revolution was fought. I happen to know that Abraham Lincoln said that this nation could not long endure half slave and half free, nor can it long endure part citizen and part subject, and I happen to know that Abraham Lincoln never defended or advocated bribery—

Mr. HEPBURN. I want to ask the gentleman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. LENTZ. I can not yield. The gentleman knows my time is limited to five minutes. William McKinley carried my district by 735 votes, and by the assistance of bribery and crimes innumerable and an expenditure of a corruption fund of many thousands of dollars my opponent carried it by 18 votes. I am willing to stand on that vote as a vindication of my record in Congress. Bribery right-handed and bribery left-handed was committed by men in high places and low places, and I charge that your assistant chief of the Secret Service, William J. Burns, appointed by and with the consent of William McKinley, and E. J. Miller, also a Presidential appointee, being surveyor of the port of Columbus, went arm in arm down into a little back shanty in an alley and bought 11 negro votes in one bunch. That is the election and defeat you are throwing at me; and these two Presidential appointees spent the day of election in corrupting impoverished voters, and that is your manly and heroic way of saving the nation's honor. You boast of the result of the work of a Secret Service agent who came there and distributed a corruption fund to the poor, miserable, impoverished creatures who needed something to keep them alive!

Yes, I was defeated by the man who said it was worth \$5,000 to defend HANNA in his Senatorial bribery case. When HANNA and DICK complained that Cyrus Huling charged too much for taking care of him in his Senatorial controversy, Mr. Huling, the Republican ex-prosecuting attorney of the county, came out in an interview and said that they did pay a "good" fee for the attorney, but they were very much in need, he said, of a "good" criminal lawyer. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] The sworn testimony taken last Friday shows that this man Huling had a ward organization in the city of Columbus which numbered about 200 men, and that they were paid five, ten, fifteen, twenty, twenty-five, and thirty dollars on the night before election, and that Huling, before paying, asked these men whether they were Democrats, and Mose Schlesinger, one of the lieutenants, a leading Democratic clerk, said, "We are paying no money except to Democrats." Yes, I was defeated by bribery, and you are welcome to all the glory and satisfaction you can get out of it.

Mr. MAHON. We get a good deal. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. LENTZ. If that is the way you perpetuate the national honor, keep on. The people will find you out. I am perfectly willing to stand on my record. Mr. McKinley carried the district in 1896 by 248 votes and I carried it by 49 votes. McKinley in 1900 carried it by 735, while my opponent ran 717 votes behind his ticket and carried the district by only 18 votes, although many hundreds were secured for him by bribery, and I am not even charged with securing a single vote by so much as a dollar of corruption fund on my part. Every one of the votes—if I do say it—that went into the box for myself was from the unpurchased and unpurchasable manhood of the district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Military Academy Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. IRVING P. WANGER,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 27, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 12346) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902.

Mr. WANGER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: It is to be regretted that the investigation into the practice of hazing at the Military Academy has been so recently concluded that members of the House and Senate have not been able to read the testimony taken by the court of inquiry assembled by the President and by the special committee of the

House, and have had no opportunity to form independent judgment thereon; and many, therefore, deem premature the enactment of the code of procedure reported by the committee, especially as the same has not been reported upon by the Superintendent of the Academy and others who might be termed experts in military jurisprudence or academic discipline.

But, with the accumulation of important measures the enactment of which is imperative before the 4th of March, it is useless to lament a condition which was unavoidable, and the House is face to face with the question whether it will voice the earnest desire of an overwhelming proportion of the people of the country and enact a mandate which will call for the exercise of the utmost wisdom in constructing regulations and perhaps lead the legal advisers of the Academy to adopt the view of the Senate and many members of the House that no constitutional or legal obstacle exists to as complete methods being established, with the approval of the Secretary of War, as the code reported by the House committee contained for the ascertainment of the facts touching the discipline at the Academy and the punishment of offenders.

The amendment to the bill, with the amendments agreed on in conference, will make it read:

That the Superintendent of the Military Academy shall make such rules, to be approved by the Secretary of War, as will effectually prevent the practice of hazing, and any cadet found guilty of participating in or encouraging or countenancing such a practice shall be summarily expelled from the Academy, and shall not thereafter be appointed to the Corps of Cadets or be eligible as a commissioned officer in the Army or Navy or Marine Corps until two years after the graduation of the class of which he was a member.

This language is apparently adequate, and unless the interpretation put upon the constitutional rights of cadets and the privileges conferred upon them by Congress is reiterated and persisted in the Superintendent will have abundant authority, and it will be a question of his sincerity of purpose and ability to meet the requirements of the situation, and I am glad to believe he has both.

The conditions are unusually favorable for the eternal eradication of the term "beast" as incident to an appointee to the Academy and the language and treatment during the first year of study and training logically flowing from the conception of appropriate treatment suggested by the use of that vile appellation. The efforts of the superintendent and commandant bore rich fruit in the abolition of exercising in the camp of 1900, and the work of the court of inquiry and of the special committee was crowned with splendid success in the heroic action of the classes voluntarily taken before the committee left West Point. It required high moral courage in the face of such severe criticism as was general, and of some fierce abuse that was unmerited by the mass of cadets, to rise so grandly to the situation, and justifies the fullest confidence in the manly and heroic attributes of the young men who so bravely and loyally bowed to the will of their country.

The action of the classes guarantees a cordiality of cooperation with the authorities auguring well for the future, and much as a comprehensive and permanent method of procedure was to be desired, perhaps it is just as well to get away from the passion aroused by recent discoveries and agitation, and have the benefit of further observation and experience before legislating for the greater efficiency and glory of the Academy. Your committee had as much in mind in its recommendations—the promotion of closer relations between officers and cadets, and the restoration of the ties of esteem, respect, and affection, as in the days of Grant and Lee, Sheridan and Jackson at the Academy, as it had the punishment of the offenders; and the attainment of this result and firm establishment in the belief of the people in the character of the cadets for courteous chivalry as well as heroic valor must be our continuing object until the victory is fully won.

The Late Hon. Frank G. Clarke.

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. STEWART,

OF NEW JERSEY,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, February 23, 1901,

On the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. FRANK G. CLARKE, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of New Hampshire.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may now be given for paying fitting tribute to his memory.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy of the same to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as an additional mark of respect the House, at the conclusion of the memorial exercises of the day, do adjourn.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey said:

Mr. SPEAKER: FRANK G. CLARKE, in the maturity of manhood, in the glowing flush of hope and aspirations, has passed away. Genial, sunny, strong, and loving, he dies when life is richest and fullest in purpose and power for good.

We entered Congress together, and abided at the same hotel. How well I can remember him through the sad shades of memory, seated at the breakfast table with loving wife and his beautiful child daughter, Bessie. The early morning sunlight was about them, and their faces were aglow after the slumbers of the night. The bright cynosure was Bessie, the darling of father and mother. With what pride they watched her happy progress and listened to the sweet whisperings of her tongue. The father, buoyant, hopeful, and strong, was to make a name and fame worthy of her future. The mother regarded both with love and constancy, and believed all things possible for husband and daughter.

But lo! the black shadows of death are cast across that sunny morning picture, and the strong hand that was to build the edifice, that was to create the fairyland for wife and daughter, has been laid low.

Each succeeding death of friends intensifies the darkness of the great mystery; an additional light is put out, and we call in the darkness for an answer, but the only response is the wail of an everlasting and meaningless echo.

In these conditions of mystification and dread religion can alone console us, and we can sing with the poet:

'Tis this, my friends, that streaks my morning bright;

'Tis this that gilds the horrors of the night.

When wealth forsakes us and when friends are few,

When friends are faithless and when foes pursue,

'Tis this that wards the blow or stills the smart,

Disarms affliction and repels his dart.

Within the breast bids holy raptures rise,

Bids smiling conscience spread her cloudless skies.

Without this consolation of religion, depths call unto depths, shadows chase shadows, and an endless chain of enigmas challenge each other forever and ever in hopeless chaos. We are without anchor, without a starry firmament of peace and hope, without a consuming longing in a faith of a fixity and happiness, an eternal abiding place beyond the grave.

CLARKE had this faith; his character was rugged and strong, intrepid in time of danger, gentle and soothing in time of trouble, a wise counselor, a helpful and cheerful friend.

May time deal sweetly with the disconsolate widow, and may little Bessie blossom into that glorious womanhood which she now gives promise of and which was the tender hope in the great heart of her departed father.

Proposed Ship Subsidies.

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONELSON CAFFERY,

OF LOUISIANA,

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Monday, February 11, 1901.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, having under consideration the bill (S. 727) to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary—

Mr. CAFFERY said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: The title of the pending bill furnishes the hope that some great public purpose is to be subserved by its enactment. That title is "to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary."

No one can doubt, Mr. President, that that is a great public purpose; but a careful inspection of the body of the bill discloses that the purpose is other than that set out in the title, and that purpose is to furnish a gratuity, a donation, to certain steamship lines now in existence and others that may come into existence if the bill becomes a law. That any great increase to our merchant marine will result I doubt, for the reason that I think the existing lines and the ships under contract for construction will absorb the subsidy to such an extent as to discourage other lines or other ships from engaging in the foreign trade.

It is necessary, in my opinion, Mr. President, to ascertain what the provisions of this bill are before discussing their merits. Before I go into this discussion, I will say that, while I am not old in legislation or in construing bills, this bill is the most complex, the most intricate, that ever I had anything to do with. Close study and clear analysis are required to understand and unravel the purposely obscure and involved meaning of the bill.

The first section contains a provision designed to mask what would otherwise appear as an unconstitutional donation. It provides that from and after the 1st of July, 1901, there shall be paid, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the owner or owners of any ship duly registered by a citizen or citizens of the United States, and being engaged in the foreign trade at the time and entered in the United States from a foreign port, compensation as therein—

after provided. Now, anybody would suppose that the compensation was to flow directly. That is not the case. This compensation is to be the subject-matter of a contract.

Right after these provisions for the payment of money out of the Treasury to the owners of American ships in the foreign trade here comes a provision for a contract. Now, what does that mean? It is set out that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to enter into a contract with any owner of such ships as are described for the payment of the compensation to be earned by them. Right here is an effort to place under the form of a contract what is a pure gratuity, and this effort is to guarantee to these subsidy receivers a future claim for any balance of bounty that they may have earned over and beyond the \$9,000,000 set out in the bill. It is to fasten upon the people of the United States for an indefinite period, extending over a great many years, the payment of the whole subsidy provided for in the bill if it exceed the \$9,000,000 limit.

There is no man who reads the provisions of this bill who does not know that that limit, if not reached in the first year after the bill goes into operation, will be reached in the second year, and that then the \$9,000,000 will have to be prorated. After the expiration of the term limited in the bill for the subsidy, whether it be twenty-five years or fifteen years, the subsidy receivers will hold the United States bound under the form of a contract. That is the first provision in the bill.

It is an attempt to cover under contract, binding upon the taxpayers of the United States for an indefinite period, the enormous sums of money which will be given to these shipowners under the provisions of this bill. Whoever before heard of a subsidy to be given under the form of a contract? The bounty that was given to the sugar planters did not contain any such evasive and artful provision as this.

The money went directly into their pockets. All that was required of the bounty receivers was that they should comply with certain regulations made by the Secretary of the Treasury before they could receive the bounty. But here a great lawyer has inserted into this bill this insidious and evasive provision in order to hold the people of the United States bound beyond any limit prescribed in the bill for the whole amount of subsidy that the ships may earn.

This bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury may contract—God save the mark—with the owners of any ship, steam or sail, engaged in the foreign trade for the bounty to be given in the bill. The bounty to be allowed to all vessels is to be regulated by the mileage. The ships are to receive a cent and a half per gross ton per 100 miles for every 1,500 miles sailed on the outward or homeward voyage, and 1 cent per gross ton for every 100 miles in excess of the 1,500 miles either way.

That is a pure mileage subsidy. The bill then provides that no vessel shall be entitled to full compensation under this clause unless she shall have cleared from a port of the United States with a cargo to the amount of 50 per cent of her capacity for carrying commercial cargo. The ocean greyhounds have a very limited capacity for carrying commercial cargo in proportion to their gross tonnage. This provision was evidently inserted for the benefit of those vessels.

It will be seen hereafter, as I discuss the provisions of this bill, that those fleet steamers, over 12 knots and up to 18 knots and over, have a very large gross tonnage and a very small capacity for commercial cargo. For instance, one of these steamers, I believe the *St. Paul*, has a gross tonnage of eleven thousand six hundred and odd tons, and her capacity for carrying commercial cargo is about 3,500 tons. She has only to carry 50 per cent of that amount of tonnage in order to be entitled to full compensation.

But, Mr. President, that is not all. She need carry under this provision but a trifle of the cargo, as will be seen from the following:

And any shortage in the amount of cargo required and defined as aforesaid shall diminish the amount of the compensation in this section provided for in the proportion that such shortage bears to the total cargo or its equivalent so required.

So then, under the language I have read, one of these large ships, which, it will be hereafter seen, earns enough subsidy by the speed requirement, need carry but a trifle of cargo, if any, because her compensation is to be reduced in the proportion that she fails to carry the 50 per cent. Of course, they do not get compensation for their full capacity for carrying commercial cargo if they do not carry it. This provision as to a requirement of 50 per cent of cargo is another blind. It allows fleet vessels to sail in ballast if immigrants or tourists pay better than freight.

There is no other penalty for not carrying 50 per cent of cargo than a reduction of compensation. But the fraud of the provision is that it says no vessel shall receive full compensation unless she shall clear from a port of the United States with a cargo of 50 per cent of her capacity for carrying cargo, and then says that compensation is to be reduced by not carrying any cargo at all.

Truly, foreign trade is greatly advanced by a provision giving bounty and yet not compelling freight to be carried.

Now, Mr. President, I come to clause (b) of this first section which provides that—

(b) Steam vessels which may be suitable for carrying the mails of the United States and as auxiliaries to the power of the United States in time of war or other need, if of the following tonnages and capable of maintaining the following rates of speed under the conditions hereinafter provided, shall, in addition to the compensation provided in clause (a) of this section—

That is the clause I have been discussing—

receive compensation per gross ton, for each 100 nautical miles sailed, at the following rates, namely:

Vessels over 2,000 gross tons:

First. Twelve knots and less than 14 knots, five-tenths of 1 cent per gross ton.

Second. Fourteen knots and less than 15 knots, 1 cent per gross ton.

Third. Fifteen knots and less than 16 knots, 1.1 cents per gross ton.

Fourth. Sixteen knots or over, 1.2 cents per gross ton.

These vessels must be over 2,000 gross tons. Then we come to vessels over 4,000 gross tons:

Vessels over 4,000 gross tons:

Fifth. Seventeen knots and less than 18 knots, 1.4 cents per gross ton.

Sixth. Eighteen knots and less than 19 knots, 1.6 cents per gross ton.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] offered an amendment, which has been adopted, to strike out all below what I have read, including the 19-knot, 20-knot, and 21-knot ships, so that the speed subsidy for vessels over 19 knots, 20 knots, and 21 knots need not be now considered so far as the Senate is concerned. There is no telling what the House will do. It may cling to the original bill in that particular, but as the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island has been accepted, I will discuss only the bill according to that amendment.

It will be seen that this is a clear bounty given for speed. It will be seen later on in this discussion, from the evidence which I will introduce, that the ships which are calculated to get the most subsidy are the ships not included in this very high speed allowance. This speed allowance is made purposely, therefore, for the vessels of the International Navigation Company which are now, in the language of the bill, established in a foreign trade between a port of the United States and a foreign port.

This mileage must be computed upon the distance between the United States and Europe and vice versa on the customary route sailed by vessels across the ocean.

After this provision for speed comes a provision, clause (d) of this section, that a foreign-built vessel admitted to American registry under the provisions of the bill shall only be entitled to "50 per cent of the rate fixed by this section."

Then follows another provision that no more than \$2,000,000 of the subsidy proposed to be given by the bill shall in any one fiscal year be paid to the vessels which I have described in clause (b), and that of the limitation of \$9,000,000 the vessels on the Atlantic shall receive no more than 70 per cent and the vessels on the Pacific coast no more than 30 per cent, and in case the vessels on the Atlantic coast do not absorb the 70 per cent allowed them they may be allowed to dip over into the subsidy set apart for the vessels of the Pacific coast, and if the Pacific coast ships do not absorb their 30 per cent they shall be allowed to dip over into the subsidy provided for the ships on the Atlantic coast.

Then, sir, in clause (f) there is a provision which was adverted to by the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER] as extending the period of this subsidy for thirty years. That provision is as follows:

(f) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby further authorized and directed to contract with any citizen or citizens of the United States (including as such citizens corporations created under the laws of the United States or any of the States thereof) who shall apply to said Secretary within five years next after the passage of this act for a contract such as is in this act provided—

One of these lovely contracts that I have spoken of—

and shall, on applying for such contract, give bond * * * in a penal sum equal to \$10 per gross ton of the vessel or vessels, * * * with security to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

That he will build within five years succeeding the giving of the bond a vessel or vessels in the United States for the foreign trade in tonnage equal to the amount of the tonnage of the vessels already registered in the trade and for which they receive subsidy.

Notwithstanding the limit made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], this would extend the limit of subsidy to twenty-five years, as he only reduces the term in the bill by five years. The original limit is twenty years, and as these provisions in clause (f) allow the contract to be filed with the Secretary of the Treasury within five years after the passage of the act to build a vessel five years after that, they clearly extend the term for the building of the vessel to ten years, and then the contract can be made for fifteen or twenty, as the old provision or a new one lasts.

Mr. ALDRICH. Has the Senator from Louisiana done me the honor to read the amendment which I offered to clause (f), and which is the amendment now pending before the Senate?

Mr. CAFFERY. I have not seen the amendment. What is that amendment, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. ALDRICH. It changes the nature of the clause entirely. It provides that no contract shall be made unless the ships have already been commenced. It eliminates the provision in regard to bonds for building ships hereafter.

Mr. CAFFERY. Was that the amendment the Senator attempted to introduce the last day this bill was debated?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; I attempted to have it acted on.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator let me ask him what would be regarded as "commenced" under his amendment?

Mr. ALDRICH. I should suppose the laying of the keel and the work of actual construction.

Mr. SPOONER. It does not mean that the ship would not be commenced until the entire keel was laid.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should think so, at any rate.

Mr. SPOONER. What would be the practical proper construction of the word "commenced"—when the vessel was commenced?

Mr. ALDRICH. I should say the actual construction of the ship would not be commenced until the keel had been laid.

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator will talk so that we can hear him on this side.

Mr. SPOONER. I asked the Senator from Rhode Island what he understands would be the construction of the word "commenced" in the building of a ship. What does that mean?

Mr. ALDRICH. There are two elements which are necessary to satisfy the Secretary of the Treasury; first, that a contract has actually been made with some responsible parties for the building of the ship, and, second, that the work of construction has actually commenced. If I were Secretary of the Treasury, in construing that I would construe it when the keel was actually laid.

Mr. SPOONER. The whole keel?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; the whole keel.

Mr. CAFFERY. I will ask the Senator what time he provides that this contract shall be filed—within five years?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; whenever the ships are actually under construction within five years.

Mr. CAFFERY. You have no limit, then, to the time when the ship shall be finished?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; it must be finished within a reasonable time, not exceeding three years.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Let the amendment to which the Senator alludes be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RAWLINS in the chair). The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, line 20, strike out all after the word "contract" down to and including line 8, on page 8, and insert:

Prove to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that he or they (the said citizen or citizens) has or have already contracted with responsible parties for the building, within a reasonable period of time, not exceeding three years, in the United States, of a new vessel or vessels, and that the construction of the said vessel or vessels has already been begun, conditioned that the contract or contracts so to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide for the payment to the owner or owners of the new vessel or vessels so to be built, for a period of fifteen years from the date of the completion and registry of such vessel or vessels, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the—

Mr. ALDRICH. The portion read by the Secretary contains the essential part of the amendment.

Mr. PETTUS. I desire to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question, with the permission of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CAFFERY. Certainly.

Mr. PETTUS. I ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether the amendment he speaks of has been acted on by the Senate?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; I will say to the Senator that I stated when I interrupted the Senator from Louisiana that it is the amendment now pending. It has not been acted upon. I tried to secure the action of the Senate on it.

Mr. PETTUS. When was it offered?

Mr. ALDRICH. It was offered nearly two weeks ago; it was offered January 30. It has been printed and is now pending.

Mr. CAFFERY. Now, Mr. President, this is certainly a bill of surprises. After devoting our time and attention to the bill as it is printed and laid before the Senate, we are met constantly with changes in it in the shape of amendments. The bill is a difficult one at best, and it is very embarrassing to have these amendments thrust upon you at every step of the discussion.

I will say to the Senator from Rhode Island, I gather from his amendment that while the party applying for a contract may do so within three years, the ship must be actually under contract for construction at that period, and his amendment does not provide any specific time within which the ship is to be completed.

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly, within a period "not exceeding three years."

Mr. CAFFERY. I did not gather that from the reading of it. It does not say so.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that it may be read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will again read the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that that part of the amendment may be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Has or have already contracted with responsible parties for the building, within a reasonable period of time, not exceeding three years.

Mr. CAFFERY. For building within three years.

Mr. ALDRICH. For building within three years.

Mr. CAFFERY. Well, it could be construed that way. If you put in the word "completion" you will make it much clearer.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no objection to that modification of the amendment.

Mr. CAFFERY. To say merely for the building within three years leaves a doubtful construction as to whether it means completion within three years.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that the words "and completion" be inserted after the word "building." That was my purpose, certainly, in offering the amendment.

Mr. CAFFERY. This amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island will parry somewhat some of the gross features of the bill, but it is impossible to remedy the bill in any other way than by the prescription of the Arkansas hunter for his dog when he had fits. The only way, he said, that he knew how to cure him was to cut his tail off right behind his ears. The only way to remedy this bill is to destroy it. You can not patch it up with amendments.

The bill has been pending for a long time in the Senate. It has not been discussed a great deal. Notwithstanding the charge that we are delaying action on the bill, it has had but a small amount of discussion, and every time any one of these iniquitous provisions is brought to the attention of the Senate there pops up an amendment trying to remedy some of the most vicious features of the bill.

It is then limited, I understand, or proposed to be limited, to three years. As I understand the Senator from Rhode Island, anybody who files a contract for the building of a new ship under the terms of the bill shall build and complete that vessel in three years after the passage of this act, and then he is allowed fifteen years to run, which will make a subsidy of eighteen years.

Mr. HANNA. I should like to ask the Senator if he construes the bill to mean that the three years the ship is under construction it will be drawing a subsidy from the Government?

Mr. CAFFERY. No, sir.

Mr. HANNA. Then how do you make the term eighteen years?

Mr. CAFFERY. I acknowledge a mistake on that point.

Now, I should like to know what the Senator from Rhode Island is going to do with all this provision that the Secretary of the Treasury shall give additional time for the building of the new ships to be contracted for. Here is a provision that if it shall happen that any such new vessel shall without any fault or want of diligence on the part of the obligors in the bond—do you strike all that out?

Mr. ALDRICH. All that goes out.

Mr. CAFFERY. Do you intend to strike all that out?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. CAFFERY. This gives the Secretary of the Treasury the privilege, or the discretion, to enlarge the limit of time within which the vessels shall be constructed according to the rules of justice and equity.

Mr. ALDRICH. There are no bonds required under the terms of my amendment.

Mr. CAFFERY. I understand, then, that all this provision is to go out under your amendment?

Mr. ALDRICH. Everything that pertains to bonds. No bonds are to be given.

Mr. CAFFERY. I suppose the Senator from Rhode Island has got the permission of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA] that this amendment shall pass?

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope to get the consent of the Senate that it shall pass. I have not the consent of the Senator from Ohio in regard to it.

Mr. CAFFERY. I thought he was the consulting engineer on this bill.

Then the next provision is, eliminating all the balance of this clause that I have been reading, and with all these vessels contracted for, either as old vessels or new vessels, and contracting for subsidy ships of class A1, that in no case shall the same vessel be entitled to subsidy for a greater period than twenty years. I ask the Senator from Rhode Island is he going to eliminate that and put it fifteen years?

Mr. SPOONER. It has been done.

Mr. ALDRICH. That has already been done.

Mr. CAFFERY. That has been eliminated?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. CAFFERY. Then there is a provision that the vessel which has been lost, or which for certain reasons the owner who contracted for it does not want to push its building any longer, can be substituted by another.

Provided, That the vessel so substituted shall not be of a lower capacity, speed, or class than the vessel so withdrawn.

Now, here is this section:

That no vessel shall be entitled to compensation under section 1 of this act unless at least one-fourth of her crew shall be citizens of the United States or such persons as shall be within the provisions of section 2174 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Now, then, that would seem that the bill looked toward manning these ships with at least one-fourth of her crew Americans; but the succeeding provisions of this section entirely nullify and set at naught this requirement of one-fourth of the crew of a subsidized ship being American citizens:

If it shall happen at any time that the foregoing stated proportion of an American crew can not be reasonably obtained, the shipping commissioner, or the officer discharging his duties at any port of the United States, or the United States consul or the officer discharging his duties at the foreign port whence any such vessel is to clear, shall allow the shipment of persons not within the preceding description to make up the necessary number of the crew.

That entirely nullifies the requirement of having one-fourth of the crew of these ships to be American citizens.

Now, sir, it is held out as a great inducement to support the bill that it is to provide for the common defense, increase the trade, and provide seamen and auxiliary ships in case of war, and here is a provision which authorizes these ships to be manned by foreigners. Where is the provision for providing seamen in case of war that is so much vaunted? Where is the opportunity to provide for seamen capable of serving upon our war ships in time of war? Where, then, is the argument that American ships cost so much more money to be operated than foreign ships? If we are to subsidize ships for the purpose of building up an American marine and for the purpose of providing seamen in case of need, why this provision allowing these very ships to be manned by foreign sailors?

I should like to have some answer to that question. I should like to know, if we are to subsidize ships to equalize, in the language of the advocates of the bill, the cost of construction and maintenance of American ships with foreign ships, why is it that we allow these very subsidized ships to be manned by foreign crews? If we are to build up an exclusive American marine capable of assisting us in time of war we must have American seamen, according to the ideas of the advocates of the bill, and here they have provided for manning these very subsidized ships with foreign sailors, who, in a conflict between American war vessels and foreign war vessels, may desert the American flag and surrender the ship to the enemy.

Why not, Mr. President, give some of this subsidy to American seamen if the purpose is to build up not only an American merchant marine, but to build up a class of seamen who can man our war vessels in time of war? Why not subsidize these seamen instead of the ships? There is not one word or line in the bill that gives the American seaman a single cent.

Mr. HANNA. Does the Senator from Louisiana want an answer to that question?

Mr. CAFFERY. I do.

Mr. HANNA. To increase our merchant marine to the capacity which would be allowed under the bill would about quadruple the tonnage of the American merchant marine. In order to have seamen we must have ships. We have not any ships in the foreign trade that amount to anything, and, naturally, those who would seek that employment, there being no such ships, have not been looking for seamen's places.

Our increasing Navy, multiplying it as we have done in the last five or six years, also makes an increased demand.

There must be a beginning; there must be the work done, the places offered, by first building the ships.

The portion of the subsidy that goes to the sailors on American ships is the increased wages enabled by the bill to be paid by American shipowners. The wages are about double that of any other country, and more than double that of many other countries. Any sailor who ships aboard an American vessel, whether he is a foreigner or a citizen of the United States, or a declared citizen of the United States, receives the same wages that are paid to all American sailors.

That is the inducement which will be effective in increasing the personnel of our merchant marine. We all know that the Norwegian, Swedish, and Danish sailors are the best in the world, and that they are now largely in the majority amongst our sailors both inland and on salt water. They are attracted to this service because they receive and are paid better wages. If we did not do anything that would enable American shipowners to pay these wages, of course the sailors would not receive any better wages than they receive in foreign service; but the fact that we are equalizing the wages and that we are able to pay 100 per cent more wages than are paid by European nations will attract sailors to the American merchant marine. As a natural result of that course they will soon become citizens of the United States, as nearly all immigrants become citizens in time.

This bill, in that feature of it, proposes to lay the foundation for just what the Senator suggests. If people who are American born are not attracted to the sea for the reason that they can do better elsewhere, then, when immigrants come to this country, who have been accustomed to following the sea, and are attracted to our ships by the fact that they will receive higher wages, owing to the steadily increasing demand for that kind of labor, the result will naturally be worked out which the Senator has in mind.

[At this point Mr. JONES of Arkansas raised the question of the presence of a quorum, and the roll was called.]

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, it took the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA] a very long time to answer the question I had propounded to him—not to him particularly, but to anyone on that side who chose to answer. I am not at all satisfied with his answer. The Senator assumes in his answer two facts, neither of which I think is correct.

He assumes, first, that the American seamen now charge, or get when they are employed, 100 per cent more than the foreign seamen. He states, second, that it is necessary to give a subsidy in order to build ships so as to give this 100 per cent, and that the 100 per cent will be given.

Mr. President, we know that these subsidized lines of American steamships are paying to-day not one single cent more than they can hire seamen for. We know that the subsidized mail ships upon the Pacific coast employ Chinamen as a large portion of their crews; we know that the International Navigation Company, which has mail contracts, and is subsidized as heavily for that purpose as British ships, is not employing any American seamen, or but few. That negatives the fact, therefore, that subsidy employs American seamen.

These subsidies do not tend in their ultimate working to give seamen one single cent more than seamen can be employed for in the markets of the world. If, sir, this subsidy proposed to be given to these American ships is for the purpose of increasing American seamen's wages, I should like to know why, ex industria, this provision is inserted in the bill to allow the employment of foreign seamen after the ships shall have obtained the subsidy and after the American merchant marine shall have been built up. Given the demand for sailors and given the ships, which you could have by buying or building, you will have all the sailors wanted, at fair wages.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. CAFFERY. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is the proposition which the Senator is making, I suppose for his party, to start upon a new know-nothing crusade and allow no man to serve on a ship who was not born in the United States? Is that the proposition he is making?

Mr. CAFFERY. That is not the proposition I am making. I refer to any American, whether born in the United States or naturalized in the United States. I am making no proposition for the building of American steamships. I am simply now trying to analyze your proposition.

Mr. ALDRICH. I thought the Senator in doing that was suggesting that we ought to employ only people who were born in the United States.

Mr. CAFFERY. I am not suggesting anything. I will give you my views later on. I am only attempting to analyze your proposition.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was trying to find out whether the reorganized Democracy, of which the Senator is a leading representative, was going to adopt that as one of the features of its new platform.

Mr. CAFFERY. The new reorganized Democracy will stand on free ships. There are but two who belong to that illustrious party that I know of. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPOONER. Sailing to what port?

Mr. CAFFERY. Sailing to the port of Washington, and, speaking figuratively, to plant, triumphantly, the Democratic flag over the Dome of this Capitol in about ten years.

Mr. BURROWS. Make it fifty. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAFFERY. Now, Mr. President, to come back to the answer of the Senator from Ohio. He has a very strong and vivid imagination if he can set aside the laws of trade, the laws of supply and demand, and make a subsidy work wonders in increasing the wages of employees. There is not an instance on record where a protected manufacturer, where a man engaged in any pursuit gets any aid from the Government, ever goes into the market and pays his employees one dime more than the market requires him to pay.

Mr. MALLORY. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CAFFERY. Certainly.

Mr. MALLORY. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that there are two nations in the world which subsidize more lavishly than any others—France and Italy—and I believe the wages of the seamen of those nations are considerably less than those of British sailors or American sailors, according to the opinion as expressed by Senators on the other side. In other words, subsidy has not tended to elevate the wages of French and Italian seamen.

Mr. CAFFERY. Precisely. I am glad the Senator made that suggestion. That is in line with the general argument I have advanced on that point. The contention made in the answer of the Senator from Ohio to me is fully met and overcome by the fact as stated by the Senator from Florida.

British seamen get more than Norwegian seamen and more than French seamen, and yet it appears that neither the Norwegian nor

the French seamen get a single dime more than the price of seamen in the French market or than the French market authorizes them to get or justifies them in getting, nor do they get as much as the British seamen.

This subsidy argument, Mr. President, is all a sham. There is absolutely nothing in it. If the idea is to build up an American marine and get American seamen to man that marine by subsidies, I say—and I think I can not be successfully refuted—that the way to do that is to subsidize the seamen. No seaman is going to rest under the beautiful conjecture of the Senator from Ohio as to what is going to be done. If there is any subsidy to be given, he wants it now. He is not going to trust to the tender hearts and patriotic impulses of shipowners.

Mr. President, I remember that there was a subsidy in my State on sugar, a bounty on sugar, and if I remember full well the wages of the hands who worked in the fields, cultivated the cane, and made the sugar did not advance a cent. It is contrary to all experience, it is contrary to human nature itself, that the subsidy grabbers will ever give one centime of it to those who work for them. If the employer gives an advance of wages, it is because he is compelled to do so by the wage market, and it is not because of any patriotism, or any humanity, for subsidy dulls both patriotism and humanity. It engenders a greed and an avarice, an insatiate avarice, that nothing but more and more subsidy ever satisfies.

So, Mr. President, right upon this point of the bill is a weakness, a disclosure of the purposes of the framers of the bill to fill the pockets of these multimillionaires who own extensive shipping lines, and to deny one cent to the poor sailor before the mast or the fireman in the engine room.

Section 6 makes provision in regard to speed tests. The test of speed for these subsidy earners is four hours over an ordinary course. What a profound humbug that is! Not the speed that they run on, but the speed that they achieve in a four hours' test in ordinary weather!

Mr. President, is not that trifling with the American Senate? The bill provides a subsidy of 1.6 cents per gross ton for 18-knot ships. What is to prevent such a ship from traveling 10 knots? Is there anything in this bill? If they wanted to give a subsidy for speed, why did they not calculate the subsidy by the log of the ship; and if she made 18 knots an hour give her 18 knots an hour? But here we provide for a subsidy for an 18-knot ship on a four hours' test, when the same ship can actually sail at any speed she chooses.

Another thing, Mr. President, is to be remarked that these four ships of the International Navigation Line are put down by the Commissioner of Navigation as 21 knotters. These same ships were classed by him a year before this bill was hatched, or rather about the time the process of incubation commenced, as 20-knot ships. How do they get up to 21 knots? What divine inspiration took possession of that brilliant man who calculates speed, tonnage, and all the other intricacies of this bill for its advocates? What divine inspiration took hold of him to make a 21-knot ship out of a 20-knot ship other than to get the highest amount of subsidy under the bill? He is a superserviceable gentleman, truly.

In regard to this speed test, as we go along we will see the cat in the meal tub; we will see "the hidden hand" beneath all these lofty professions of a public purpose as set out in the title of this bill; we will see the ulterior purpose of this measure, which is to fill pockets already full and to subsidize ships already earning a fine profit. The purposes set out in the bill are simply to cater to individual or corporate greed.

Then comes a provision for subsidizing ships of the United States engaged in the deep-sea fisheries for three months at \$2 a ton. Then comes the succeeding section, giving to the crews of these vessels engaged in the deep-sea fisheries \$1 per month for their services on board those vessels. Compare that small amount of subsidy to the enormous subsidy to the greyhounds, the ships of over 12 knots an hour speed, combining both the mileage and the speed subsidy. Compare that little allowance, that little dripping, to this enormous subsidy, and we will see the purposes of this clause.

There are some vessels not allowed the subsidy, vessels in the coasting trade, vessels in the fisheries, except in deep-sea fisheries. An ordinary fishing smack can not get it. Then there is a provision which I do not exactly understand:

(e) A vessel on a voyage during any part of which she shall have carried cargo which under the laws of the United States could not lawfully have been carried in a foreign vessel.

What does that relate to?

It perhaps means that American vessels, from a port of the United States, touching at a foreign port and then landing cargo may, nevertheless, get compensation for the part of her cargo which is not domestic.

Provided, nevertheless, That any such vessel otherwise entitled to compensation under this act shall not be debarred from receiving such compensation by reason of anything in this section contained, except to the extent of the proportion which that part of her cargo pertaining to domestic commerce bears to her capacity for carrying commercial cargo.

I see no one in this Chamber reputed to be the father of the bill,

or I would ask him to explain this provision. In stress of weather and being doubtful of the meaning of the provisions which I have read, I will ask the Senator from Wisconsin what they mean. I call his attention to clause (e).

Mr. SPOONER. Why does the Senator ask me?

Mr. CAFFERY. I say I am driven by stress of weather to seek a port of information. I do not see any of the stalwart advocates of the bill present in the Chamber, and I am driven by stress of weather to ask the question of somebody for enlightenment, and I know my friend is informed all around on almost every subject before the Senate.

Mr. SPOONER. Perhaps the friends of the bill would prefer the Senator from Louisiana to select somebody else.

Mr. CAFFERY. I will cease inquiry after this disclaimer from the Senator from Wisconsin, and will propound no question to him as to the provisions of the bill. I will ask the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], who appears to take a lively interest in this bill and to be one of its strong advocates, what clause (e) of section 9 means. I fail to understand it.

(e) A vessel on a voyage during any part of which she shall have carried cargo which under the laws of the United States could not lawfully have been carried in a foreign vessel.

I do not understand that provision. I do not know what it means. I do not know at what it is leveled. Unless my ignorance can be enlightened by the Senator from Rhode Island I will have to pass it over.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will wait. It would take longer than I care to interrupt the Senator from Louisiana. After he is through his remarks, to-day or to-morrow—

Mr. SPOONER. Or some other day.

Mr. ALDRICH. Or some other day, I will examine it carefully and see if I can throw any additional light on it.

Mr. BACON. Does the Senator from Rhode Island mean that he has not yet examined it?

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, yes; I have examined it.

Mr. BACON. I wish the Senator would give us the information now, if he has it.

Mr. CAFFERY. If the Senator from Rhode Island will not answer my question I shall have to take my chagrin as best I can, and hope in the fortitude of my nature to get over such a setback. I will, for the present, skip the succeeding clauses, and come to clause (h) of section 9:

(h) A vessel on a voyage less than one-half of the whole length of which, on her outward and homeward voyages, respectively, shall have been on the sea, between a port of the United States and a foreign port.

That appears to me to exclude vessels that are engaged in the foreign trade between a port of the United States and a near-by port in Central America; and why? Why is that done? What purpose is there lurking behind the provision? Because less than one-half of the whole voyage is on a sea between a port of the United States and some near-by foreign port, is that any reason to deny such a vessel the subsidy proposed to be given in this bill? I can not see any reason for it. It is simply to cut out vessels which sail, say, from New York to Colon, from New York to some near-by port in South America, because less than one-half of the voyage will be on the sea between a port of the United States and a foreign port. Why this is put in I do not know, unless it will be of some advantage, in some way or somehow, to these big steamship companies.

Mr. President, I come to clause (a) of section 10. This clause allows American registry to such foreign-built vessels as were established in a foreign freight or passenger business, or both, on or before the 1st day of February, 1899, and as shall be entitled to receive class A1 of registry. These vessels must be owned entirely by American citizens, including as citizens corporations, or by a foreign corporation, a majority of the stock of which should be owned by American citizens, and upon the American citizens procuring a transfer of the whole ownership before the 1st of February, 1899.

No more than four of such vessels for any single corporation, association, or individual shall be allowed registry.

Then comes clause (b) of this section. It authorizes American registry to such foreign-built vessels as were under contract for construction by American citizens, or a foreign corporation of which a majority of the stock shall have been owned by an American citizen or corporation on or before the 1st day of February, 1899, and copies of which contracts shall have been filed with the Secretary of the Treasury on or before the 1st of February, 1899, and which vessels shall have been completed or in course of completion before the 1st of January, 1900, and shall, when built or completed, be entitled to receive class A1 in the record of American and foreign shipping, or the United States Standard Owners, Builders, and Underwriters' Association.

There is a proviso attached to this section that the number of foreign ships to be admitted under the provisions of it shall not be over four for any one line, individual, corporation, or association, and that the application for the registry steamships completed shall have been made four months after the date of the passage of the

act; and in respect of such steamships as may be completed after its passage, within four months after date of such completion. It is provided, further, that a bond shall be given as provided for in other sections of the bill for building an equal amount of tonnage as was registered by the American owners under the provisions of the clause.

That is one of the most extraordinary sections in the bill. It looks to me like an absolute monopoly of the foreign shipping in the hands of those already established in the foreign trade and under contract in foreign countries. Why does this bill provide first for giving the subsidy to such foreign ships as were established in a foreign trade between the United States and foreign ports, or such ships as were contracted for prior to the 1st of February, 1899, by Americans, or by foreign corporations, a majority of the stock of which was owned by Americans?

Does not that give an opportunity to monopolize all the benefits of the bounty to be conferred upon foreign-built ships into the hands of those who are now running those foreign lines and who propose to extend those lines to larger capacity?

I wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury some days ago asking him to furnish me with a list of the vessels relative to which contracts of construction had been filed in his Department on or before the 1st of February, 1899, and this is his response:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.
Washington, February 6, 1901.

Sir: Complying with your request of the 5th instant, I inclose a list of contracts filed in this Department with the Bureau of Navigation on or before the 1st day of February, 1899, for the construction abroad of foreign ships. You refer to clause (b) of section 9, Senate bill 727. The reprint of this bill January 29, 1901, gives the section in question as section 10. Under that section the Department understands that some of the vessels covered by the contracts are not eligible to American registry.

Respectfully,

The Hon. DONELSON CAFFERY, United States Senate.

Here is the list of vessels inclosed.

There are four for the International Navigation Company, contracts for the construction of which abroad were filed with the Secretary of the Treasury at the dates I will mention.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator state whether the size of those ships is given?

Mr. CAFFERY. The size is not given. W. R. Grace comes in for one, the *Cumbal*, January 4, 1899. Then comes in a Mr. B. N. Baker. He registered contracts for 13 ships, as follows: *Minneapolis*, April 7, 1897; *Minnehaha*, the same date; *Minnevaaka*, the same date; *Minnetonka*, the same date; *Mobile*, October 28, 1898; *Mississippi*, the same date; *Massachusetts*, the same date.

[At this point Mr. BACON raised the question of the presence of a quorum, and the roll was called.]

Mr. CAFFERY. I was proceeding to read the list of vessels registered by Mr. B. N. Baker, and had got down to the ship *Mobile*, contracted for October 28, 1898. Then there are the *Mississippi*, the same date; the *Massachusetts*, the same date; the *Manitoba*, the same date, and 5 not named, the same date, making 13 ships, contracts for the construction of which were filed with the Secretary of the Treasury on the dates I have mentioned, commencing April 7, 1897. W. D. Munson, 2 ships not named, January 10, 1899; Jefferson Hogan, *Mariposa* and *Mincola*, January 30, 1899; C. W. and J. Hogan, *Mohawk* and 11 not named, same date; Lorenzo Daniels, 2 not named; Oswald Sanderson, 6.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CAFFERY. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. Are the contracts for the construction of those ships supposed to be on file?

Mr. CAFFERY. They are actually filed.

Mr. SPOONER. The contracts themselves?

Mr. CAFFERY. Yes, sir; the contracts for the construction of the ships I have mentioned were actually filed in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury at the dates mentioned by me in reading over this list.

Mr. SPOONER. This paper does not show the tonnage?

Mr. CAFFERY. It does not show the tonnage.

Mr. SPOONER. I suppose the contracts will.

Mr. CAFFERY. I ask that this letter of the Secretary and the list of ships may be inserted in the Record as a part of my remarks. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The papers will be printed in the Record, in the absence of objection.

Mr. MALLORY. I should like to ask the Senator if he will not have the papers read again?

Mr. CAFFERY. I will send them to the desk and have them read.

The Secretary read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.
Washington, February 6, 1901.

Sir: Complying with your request of the 5th instant, I inclose a list of contracts filed in this Department with the Bureau of Navigation on or before the 1st day of February, 1899, for the construction abroad of foreign ships. You refer to clause (b) of section 9, Senate bill 727. The reprint of this bill January 29, 1901,

gives the section in question as section 10. Under that section the Department understands that some of the vessels covered by the contracts are not eligible to American registry.

Respectfully,

L. J. GAGE, Secretary.

Hon. DONELSON CAFFERY, United States Senate.

Ships contracted for abroad under clause (b), section 9, of Senate bill 727 (section 10 of the bill as reprinted).

Owner.	Name.	Date of contract.
International Navigation Co	Vaderland	Nov. 22, 1898
	Zeeland	Do.
	Marion	Dec. 14, 1898
	Haverford	Do.
W. R. Grace	Cumbal	Jan. 4, 1899
B. N. Baker	Minneapolis	Apr. 7, 1897
	Minnehaha	Do.
	Minnevaaka	Do.
	Minnetonka	Do.
	Mobile	Oct. 28, 1898
	Mississippi	Do.
	Massachusetts	Do.
	Manitoba and 5 not named.	Do.
W. D. Munson	2 not named	Jan. 10, 1899
Jefferson Hogan	Mariposa	Jan. 30, 1899
	Mincola	Do.
C. W. and J. Hogan	Mohawk and 11 not named.	Do.
Lorenzo Daniels	2 not named	Do.
Oswald Sanderson	Consuelo	Jan. 20, 1899
	Tactician	Do.
	Not named	Do.
do	Jan. 11, 1899
do	Jan. 20, 1899
	Toronto	Jan. 10, 1899

In all, 42 steamships.

Mr. CAFFERY. Now, Mr. President, it appears that this bill was first introduced in the Senate by Mr. HANNA December 19, 1898, and in the House by Mr. PAYNE January 27, 1899. So it appears that these vessels under contract for construction abroad were contracted for, some of them, as far back as April 7, 1897. Four of them were contracted for twenty months before this bill was filed in the Senate, nearly all of them a year and over before the 1st of February, 1899.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the Senator from Louisiana allow me to ask him whether there is any law authorizing these contracts to be made?

Mr. CAFFERY. I can only answer the learned Senator from Alabama by saying that I suppose a tip from the consecrated committee which was selected to frame this bill is equal to a law.

Mr. MORGAN. But does the Senator know of any law?

Mr. CAFFERY. I know of no law.

Now, Mr. President, was ever before such a provision contained in any bill in any civilized country governed under republican institutions? Here is a provision, retroactive in its character, inserted in this bill permitting contracts to be filed anywhere from twenty months to many years before the bill could rationally or reasonably be supposed to become a law, and to come in to reap the benefit of its provisions.

There never was in any civilized country ruled by republican institutions such a feature in any legislative bill proposed to become a law. In the sequel I shall have something to say about the formation of the committee which created the bill, but for present purposes I will only say that this feature in the bill, without one single word of argument, is enough to damn it.

This feature in the bill, Mr. President, reaches out and almost names the beneficiaries under it. This feature industriously tells the particular pets and beneficiaries of the proposed law that they must do something in advance which nobody else can do or which nobody would do unless guaranteed the completion of the proposal into a law. What American citizen who was not behind the curtain and was not a part and parcel of the enormous force driving this bill through the Senate would undertake the risk of making a contract abroad for the construction of vessels to be entered into the foreign trade did he not know that this proposal was to become a law, and who knew that except those who were taken into the private counsel of the committee of twenty-five who hatched this bill?

This feature of the bill is indefensible. This feature of the bill allows people on the inside, people who had the tip, to monopolize all the foreign trade between the United States and foreign ports by reason of constructing in advance vessels under this extraordinary proposal or this extraordinary invitation.

The Senator from Alabama wanted to know what authority there was for filing any contracts of this sort. What business had the Secretary of the Treasury to entertain a proposition even to file such contracts? You could file contracts in the Treasury Office for anything under heaven if these contracts could be filed. The Treasury Office will be piled up with all sorts of contracts for all sorts of purposes if this is to be a precedent. A keen scent is the proverbial quality of your ordinary bounty hunter; but here is given a tip special to a select band of bounty hunters. A committee to frame the bill gives out its largess to itself long in advance.

No, Mr. President, this feature of the bill discloses the ulterior purpose to monopolize all the benefits to accrue from its provisions into the hands of a selected few, selected twenty months before the bill was filed, selected many years before the bill could possibly become a law. Here were some of these contracts filed as early as April, 1897. The first bill was introduced December, 1898, and this is February, 1901, and the bill is not yet a law. But I suppose these especial favorites of the committee of twenty-five can bide their time in patience, knowing full well that the apple is ripening upon the tree and will shortly fall into their laps.

I see that the concern of which Mr. Griscom is at the head, described by the eloquent Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TURLEY] as the modest Mr. Griscom, has registered in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury, and heads the list in that regard, 4 ships. Mr. Griscom, I am afraid, will lose his title of "modest" unless activity in the pursuit of advantages be construed to be modesty. He certainly will not be called immodest in the eye of the friends of this measure for being the first man upon the list to derive the benefits of this prearranged, foreordained, and elected subsidy.

Why, sir, it almost ought to have a place in the doctrine of a certain church. There is something like foreordination about this thing; there is something like election about it. Mr. Griscom has been called and called to join the army of the shipbuilding saints and to enjoy all the blessings of a paradise of subsidy.

Mr. President, I would like to know what is the just criticism of the proposition that, if subsidy is to be allowed at all to foreign-built ships, why not open the door and give every American citizen an equal chance to get foreign ships? Why open the door to a few individuals and prevent the balance of the people of the United States from enjoying the privilege granted under the bill?

Now, this privilege is limited to four vessels to any one line, to any one individual, or firm, or association. This privilege of entering ships contracted for in foreign lands before the 1st of February, 1899, is so limited. Then, if those people are given a wink a year or two ahead, they go in and monopolize this contracting feature of the bill, and the balance of the people of the United States are shut out. Nobody else has got a chance. If this is not building up trusts, syndicates, and monopolies, I do not know what it is. Here is an invitation to monopolize the foreign trade, and we see with what avidity the impecunious gentlemen who own ships worth millions of dollars have availed themselves of the opportunity. They have plunged in twenty months ahead, before even the bill was filed in either House, in order that they might not be accused of any laches or any want of diligence in the matter.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Has the Senator from Louisiana any information as to whether the limit of four ships was put in the provision because Mr. Griscom had contracted for four ships or whether Mr. Griscom contracted for four ships because he knew beforehand that that was to be the limit?

Mr. CAFFERY. I do not know. I can not tell. Mr. Griscom's modesty might have stood him in stead. He might have been worked upon by forces of which he himself was not aware, the modest quality of his character operating so as to produce the exact coincidence of four ships to meet the subsequent requirements of the bill. He perhaps has the gift of prophecy; I do not know. He might be inspired by his modesty. But there was some subtle influence and some occult force that worked for him, the precise character of which I am unable to tell my friend from Arkansas.

Be that as it may, Mr. President, this was an opening, and a fine opening, for those to whom the tip was given to monopolize the benefits of the bill in this regard.

[At this point Mr. DANIEL raised the question of the presence of a quorum, and the roll was called.]

Mr. CAFFERY. Now, Mr. President, there is another monopolistic feature about this section to which I desire to call the attention of the Senate. In regard to the subsidy proposed by the bill to such foreign ships as were on the 1st day of February, 1899, engaged in an established freight or passenger business, or both, from a port of the United States, I desire to make some observations.

The Senate has seen with what care the framers of the bill have provided for the monopoly of contracts for the construction of foreign ships. Now, we will see that they provide a like monopoly for foreign ships already in a foreign trade. This provision does not provide subsidy for all foreign ships, whether owned by individuals or by corporations, but only for foreign ships established in a foreign trade.

That means a regular line of ships engaged in a foreign trade, to the exclusion of any American who may want to run his single ship in a foreign trade. If he does, he can not run on an established line between certain ports; he must run after the manner of the English tramp ship. He must sail from the United States with a cargo, sell it in England, get another cargo and take it to South America or somewhere else, and bring return cargo back on a triangular voyage to the United States. So this part of the bill looks with an eye single to the benefit of such lines of steamships as were well established in foreign trade between the United States and a

foreign port, known to be so established by those on the inside, and so fixed in their position that they could not be shaken.

Now, Mr. President, the other provisions of the bill mostly relate to the requirements that these subsidized ships may be substituted by others. All these fleet ships and those above 12 knots are required to carry mails, and they are required to do so without any additional subsidy. They are subject to be employed by the United States as cruisers or transports in time of war, and so on. I have not noticed all the provisions of the bill; they will suffice for the present consideration of it.

It will be seen, Mr. President, that the provisions of the bill do not follow in the regular order in which they should follow, but they are slung together heterogeneously. Provisions not cognate are found scattered through the bill, and you have to search all around in the bill for its meaning. For instance, after providing that American ships already entitled to American registry shall receive the benefits of the bill, we have to turn over to the last part of the bill to find that those ships are required to build only a quarter of the amount of tonnage to obtain a subsidy, whereas these foreign-built ships are required to build an equal amount of tonnage.

I only mention that as an illustration of the loose manner in which the provisions of the bill are slung together. It is very difficult to get at the meaning of the bill. It takes a very close and careful study to understand its provisions. A bill of this character, which involves this enormous amount of money, ought to have the most careful and deliberate discussion that the Senate can give it. It ought not, in my opinion, to be rushed through the Senate under whip and spur as if it were a party measure. I have been very much pleased to hear from certain Senators upon the other side that they did not, so far as they were concerned, regard it as a party measure.

But, Mr. President, the disclaimer of these gentlemen is hardly borne out by the facts, because the whole of the other side of the Chamber, with very few exceptions, respond to any call that is made upon them for rushing through of the bill. I will not say the whole, because there are some exceptions, and some very conspicuous exceptions.

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana what would be the effect of this provision upon the small ships?

Mr. CAFFERY. What section?

Mr. SPOONER. The one you were just referring to, requiring that before any person can receive a subsidy he shall construct 25 per cent of additional tonnage.

Mr. CAFFERY. It is section 13.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was not able to understand whether the Senator from Louisiana objected to that section because it required too much or too little.

Mr. CAFFERY. I was only illustrating the loose manner in which the bill had been framed by stating that section 13, which ought to have immediately followed the provision for subsidizing the American ships already engaged in the trade, was put away over in the back of the bill, so as almost to elude notice. The compensation applicable to the service of the existing vessels of the United States is found in section 13.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Beginning at the bottom of page 22.

Mr. CAFFERY. Down to line 12 of that section you will find the requirement of this 25 per cent of tonnage.

Mr. SPOONER. What effect will that have upon the small owners? If a man has but one ship, and that is all he has, he is not entitled, as I understand, under the provisions of this bill to receive any of this subsidy, unless he builds 25 per cent of increased tonnage or gives bond to do so. That will involve the construction of another ship or else the construction of so small a ship that he would not be entitled to subsidy.

There is no such thing as 25 per cent of a ship, or 50 per cent of a ship, or 75 per cent of a ship, but it would have to be a ship; and a person having only one ship, to be entitled to subsidy, would be obliged to build another vessel before he could receive any subsidy under this bill, or give bond to the Government that he would build another ship.

Mr. CAFFERY. Equal to 25 per cent of the tonnage of the other ship.

Mr. SPOONER. If he had but two ships he would have to build another ship; if he had three ships he would have to build another ship; and if he had four ships, under this 25 per cent provision, he would have to build only one ship.

Mr. CAFFERY. I think that construction would be good.

Mr. SPOONER. What construction?

Mr. CAFFERY. If he only had to build 25 per cent of the tonnage, and added one ship, it would be 25 per cent of the tonnage of the four ships.

Mr. SPOONER. To begin with, the vessel must be a vessel entitled to subsidy—a vessel of a certain tonnage.

Mr. CAFFERY. Exactly.

Mr. SPOONER. And if a man had only one vessel, and had not the money to build any more, he would not get any subsidy.

Mr. CAFFERY. But there are two classes of subsidies—the subsidy for tonnage and mileage, and the subsidy for speed.

Under class (a) where they are entitled to subsidy for mileage, no provision is made for the tonnage of the vessel that would be entitled to subsidy.

Mr. SPOONER. But this is what I mean:

That the compensation applicable to the service of the existing vessels of the United States provided for in this act, other than as conditioned in section 10 of this act—

which refers to fishing vessels, as I recollect it—shall be allowed and paid.

Mr. CAFFERY. It refers to more than fishing vessels. It refers to all vessels except those mentioned in section 10.

Mr. SPOONER. This is the language in section 13:

That the compensation applicable to the service of the existing vessels of the United States provided for in this act, other than as conditioned in section 10 of this act, shall be allowed and paid only on the condition precedent either that the owner or owners of a majority interest in any such now existing vessel or vessels claiming such compensation shall have given bond to the United States in a penal sum equal to \$10 per gross ton of the vessel or vessels to be contracted for as in this section provided, with surety to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury, conditioned that such owner or owners will, within five years next after the giving of such bond, make, in good faith and with responsible parties, a contract or contracts, as the case may be, for the building in the United States of a new vessel or vessels, as the case may be, of an aggregate gross tonnage at least equal to 25 per cent of the tonnage of the vessel or vessels so now existing in respect of which such compensation shall be claimed, and cause such vessel or vessels to be built within five years next after the making of such contract or contracts, respectively.

That would not bear with any great weight upon the companies which had capital and which could duplicate the tonnage; but would, or would it not, altogether exclude from the subsidy the owner of but one ship, who has all his money in that ship and who has not the funds or credit with which to build additional ships?

Mr. CAFFERY. Clearly so. So this bill is arranged all along the line for the benefit of large shipbuilders, and presumably, therefore, shipbuilders with plenty of money, because it takes a great deal of capital to go into that business.

This requirement to build 25 per cent of tonnage in order to gain the subsidy for American vessels already in the foreign trade will debar, in my opinion, the owners of small vessels.

Mr. SPOONER. And they can not run in competition with ships receiving the subsidy, and so they would have no alternative but to sell out to the others.

Mr. CAFFERY. Exactly; and then the clause is very ingeniously worded. A ship to run in the foreign trade, to amount to anything, must be of a certain tonnage. I suppose the least tonnage would be 2,000 tons to be of any avail in that trade. No man could build a ship of 500 tons, and if he did not have any more money than sufficient to build a ship of quarter of the tonnage of a 2,000-ton ship it would only be a ship of 500 tons.

This kind of a ship is utterly unfit for the foreign trade. The owner of but one or two ships is cut out by the provision giving bounty to ships established in the foreign trade, for it takes more than one ship to form an establishment in foreign trade.

So, Mr. President, this bill all along the line is designed, in my opinion, for the benefit of large shipbuilding interests, and not for small shipowners.

Before I leave this bill, I will revert to some of its concluding sections. Here is section 18, which prescribes, I suppose, something that may be said to be in the interest of building up seamen for our Navy. What is it? "That every contract made under the authority of this act shall contain a stipulation on the part of the ship-owning contractor that American boys shall be taken" and taught certain matters relating to seamanship—one American boy for so many tons. I have forgotten the number of tons.

Mr. MALLORY. One thousand tons.

Mr. CAFFERY. One American boy for every 1,000 tons. Our postal-subsidy act already contains a better provision than that. The boys to be taken upon the subsidized vessels carrying the mails are taught seamanship, are given a certain rank, and are paid, while here they are to be given no rank, they may be put in among the sailors, and no compensation is fixed for them at all except what the owners believe reasonable. One of these modest subsidy grabbers will, I suppose, deem about \$10 a month very reasonable.

Mr. President, how was this bill framed? It had the most peculiar birth of anything human or inhuman that was ever launched upon the world. It was born in the councils of a select committee of twenty-five; it had its creation in the brain of that noted committee; it received its first impulse of life from an unofficial source, but one of the highest authority, which was composed of shipbuilders, constitutional lawyers, three or four members of the Committee on Commerce, and a large number of the beneficiaries of this bill. I will read how it was formed. The Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], in his speech delivered in this body on December 4 and 5, 1900, spoke as follows:

This brings me to the consideration of the pending measure. Three years ago, instructed by resolutions of State legislatures, of political conventions, of commercial organizations, by recommendations of public officials, it seemed to me

that our people were taking a greater interest in the restoration of our merchant marine than ever before, and that it was an opportune time to once more call the attention of Congress to the subject. I found, however, a great diversity of opinion among friends of the ship as to the remedy to be proposed.

Discriminating duties had many advocates; bounties, subsidies, free ships each some. I knew that success was dependent upon united action. As a method of securing that I selected a committee of twenty-five, all friends of Congressional action; some of them shipbuilders and shipowners, experts, required for intelligent conclusions; a majority having no interest other than as American citizens; those interested, hardly any two in the same trade or in the same type of ships, selected from every part of the country; some favoring each proposed remedy except that of free ships, a majority at the start for discriminating duties.

This committee was composed as follows: Senators HANNA, ELKINS, PERKINS, FRYE, gentlemen who had shown great interest, and some of whom had had experience in shipping matters; Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE, then chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine; Charles H. Cramp, the well-known shipbuilder of Philadelphia; C. P. Huntington, who has, probably, at Newport News the finest shipyard in the world; Samuel S. Sewall, representing the largest building company of sailing ships in the country; Edwin W. Hyde, connected with the Bath shipbuilding works; C. A. Griscom, president of the American Line; Joseph P. Grace, representing the line between New York and Chile; H. P. Booth, president of the New York and Cuba Mail; William P. Clyde, president of the Clyde Steamship Company; Eugene T. Chamberlain, Commissioner of Navigation; Theodore C. Search, president of the National Manufacturers' Association, the largest association, probably, that is known in the world, having a membership from nearly every State in the Union, an association whose sole object is to promote the export trade of the United States; Aaron Vanderbilt, secretary of the American Shipping League; Harvey D. Gould, attorney for the Lake Carriers' Association, one of the most accomplished admiralty lawyers in the United States; Charles H. Keep, secretary of the Lake Carriers' Association, which represents nine-tenths of the lake interests; D. D. C. Mink, president of the Coastwise Steamship Association, having no interest in this subject except as an American citizen and understanding shipping interests; A. R. Smith, formerly editor of the *Seaboard*, now Secretary of the New York Commission of Commerce; Frank J. Firth, president of the Lake Carriers' Association, and Thomas Clyde, of the Clyde Steamship Company. The subject-matter was committed to this committee in 1897.

Mr. President, I venture the assertion that there never has been a bill framed in this Senate by a like committee. I have no imputation to make upon the bona fides of the gentlemen composing this committee. They are all, so far as I know, honorable men. What I shall or may have to say in reference to their connection with this bill is not and will not be of a personal character. But among the members of this committee there was not a single one, except the members of the Senate, outside of some close pecuniary interest, directly connected with this bill.

It is remarkable that among all that distinguished body of twenty-five there was not a single representative of what we may call the mass of the American people. There are a great many people in the United States who, in the view, perhaps, of the gentlemen who formed the committee, had no right to a voice in the framing of a bill to revive the merchant marine of the United States.

A great many of the taxpayers of the United States, upon whose shoulders fall the burden of taxation necessary to carry this bill into execution, have an idea that ships are entitled to no subsidy whatever, even if they do not believe in free ships in the way that the Democratic party used to believe in free ships. A great many believe that, with our laws as they stand—our laws affording ample protection to all the coastwise trade, our laws prohibiting any foreign-built ship to engage in the export or import trade under American registry—the American shipbuilding interests are amply protected. Was there a solitary representative of all that large class who think that free ships are a remedy, and if free ships can not be had that ships are entitled to no subsidy whatever? Not a single one.

And then look at the complexion of the committee! All were friends of the measure. It was a kind of a caucus of the shipbuilding interests. In a bill to affect the great mass of the people of the United States by this powerful arm of taxation every interest in the United States to be affected by the taxation that this bill would involve ought to have been, and should have been, if any unofficial consultation was had, equally consulted, as were the friends, the known friends, the partisans, I may say, of this measure.

What was in this measure; what was contemplated to be involved in this measure that brought about such a formidable array of money and brains and talent as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce saw fit to surround himself with? What was there in the question of upbuilding the merchant marine that a committee of this body could not have solved? Are partisans of a measure to be clothed with the high power of legislation, to frame laws solely in the interest of a certain class? Are the vast mass of taxpayers to be set aside and the beneficiaries of their taxes to be given power to frame laws in their own behalf?

What peculiar claim did this admiralty lawyer have? What peculiar claim did Mr. Search have? What peculiar claim did these other gentlemen have to whom was given the legislative power of the United States? Is that the way bills are to be framed in this body? Are bills at the start to take this partisan character? Are we to turn over our functions to the friends of a measure, or are we to legislate for the United States of America? Has it come to this point that, in the framing of a bill to operate upon every citizen in the land, the friends of the measure are to be given the power to do so? Then, Mr. President, we have dropped, in my opinion, to a level which is not contemplated under any form of republican institutions, and not only not contemplated, but one that ought never to be tolerated.

This is the genesis of this bill. It originated in the fertile brains of these friends of the measure. No outside interest that was inimical to the bill or that did not favor this peculiar method adopted by this committee was consulted. There were some outsiders who appeared in the hearings before the House committee and some before the Senate committee, and one particular gentleman to whom I will shortly make reference. I say that this bill is discredited in its very procreation. I say the paternity of this bill is enough to bastardize it. I say that no other bill that was ever framed in this body had such a paternity or was ever procreated in this same way.

Men will go a long way further in the matter of party advantage or to achieve the performance of some party end, and will use means to accomplish that end which, as private citizens, they would disdain to use. Who, sir, in determining what his county or his neighborhood ought to have, be the matter of the most trifling moment—the building of a road, the erection of a church, or any matter of public improvement—would only go about in search of the peculiar advocates and friends of the measure, when the matter affected the whole community? Not even in the most trifling matter of municipal improvement would such means be resorted to as have been resorted to in the effort to launch this bill upon the Senate as a perfect bill.

Yea, sir, it is perfect to suit the friends of the bill; it is perfect to suit the friends of this shipbuilding interest, but it is not perfect to suit the interest of the vast mass of the taxpayers of the United States. They were not consulted; and who but they should have been consulted? They were the ones to shoulder the burden of taxation necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this bill. They ought to have had a voice, and they had no voice; the doors were shut in their faces. In private conclave in an unofficial committee, with the vast mass of the people of the United States upon the outside, this bill had its origin.

Mr. President, is anybody surprised that the result of the deliberations of a body of this kind should have brought forth a bill which is so onerous to the taxpayers, and which does not even carry out the views of many who support it? It is said to be a bill "to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States," but upon close investigation of the provisions of this bill it will be discovered that it can not promote the commerce and that it will not increase the foreign trade of the United States, if it is meant by that term to increase the ships that transport the commodities that make up the foreign trade of the United States.

[At this point Mr. CAFFERY yielded to a motion by Mr. HAWLEY for an executive session.]

Mr. CAFFERY. In the connection in which I was speaking an incident occurred before the Committee on Commerce, and presumably in the presence of the select committee of twenty-five, which has struck me with peculiar significance. Mr. Hanley appeared before that committee to advocate the claims of the farmers for an export bounty upon their products exported to foreign countries.

It appears that Mr. Hanley was laying his claims before the committee when he was interrupted by the chairman with a statement to the effect that his project was utterly unconstitutional; that no bounty could be given on a product exported unless bounties were given on all products exported, and that we had some twenty-five or thirty treaties with foreign countries which stood in the way of any such measure, whereupon the distinguished chairman of the committee confronted this lone champion with the adverse opinion of one of the greatest constitutional lawyers of the United States. Now I will read what the chairman said to Mr. Hanley:

The CHAIRMAN (addressing Mr. Hanley). Now, the committee want to induce you to abandon the idea which somehow or other has gotten into the heads of your people that there can be such a thing as paying bounties on agricultural products shipped in American vessels. That is an absolute impossibility; it can not be done. It meets with flaws in every possible direction. Now, do you recognize the fact that Senator Edmunds is probably as good an authority on law and constitutional questions as there is, and you heard my request to him the other day to give his opinion, after investigation, upon the questions that have been raised by some of you gentlemen, by Mr. Hill and your Farmers' Alliance, as to this bounty; and he sent in his reply, which you heard read to-day?

Mr. HANLEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is not that conclusive?

Mr. HANLEY. Well, we are up against it.

Mr. President, there was something plaintive in the utterance of this gentleman. There was the Committee of Commerce, who had ostensibly the framing of this bill, but had it not in reality; there was the chairman rebuking, as it were, Mr. Hanley for his assurance in asking for a bounty upon the exports of agricultural products; and there was the great authority of ex-Senator Edmunds flung at him to show the indefensible attitude which he assumed; and this poor man, confronted at once with the chairman and with the high opinion of ex-Senator Edmunds, exclaimed in his despair, "We are up against it."

Yea, against the great power of this committee of twenty-five, against the great authority of the chairman of the committee, and the opinion of ex-Senator Edmunds. There he stood, this solitary representative of the agriculturists of the United States, demanding

for an industry that could receive no protection from the tariff a bounty upon exports. In his mind he could see no legal distinction between a bounty upon agricultural exports to farmers who were poor and a bounty to shipbuilders and shipowners who were multi-millionaires. The one class at least, from their pecuniary condition, deserved the bounty in his estimation, evidently, and the other, on account of their riches, did not deserve it.

Here, Mr. President, was this sole man, the only man I have any note of who appeared before that committee in the interest of the agricultural classes of the United States, and he said in effect he was up against a brass wall; there was no relief to them. But this bill, framed by the ingenuity and research of this self-constituted and prearranged committee, is one that gave all the bounties of the United States, at the expense of the class he represented, to these rich men to whom I have referred. I say, Mr. President, the situation was both dramatic and plaintive. Men who did not deserve a bounty were told or told themselves that constitutionally they were the only ones who could get it. Men who did deserve a bounty were told that constitutionally they could not get it.

Against this array of authority and these powerful influences, all working toward the framing of the pending bill, this man was as helpless as a child, and he so expressed his deplorable condition and that of the people he represented by saying, "We are all up against it"—against this impenetrable barrier against any bounty in any other direction than in this prearranged and foreordained course, to wit, into the pockets and into the coffers of these large international and foreign lines, which already enjoy a subsidy under the mail provisions enacted by Congress and are already in a condition, without subsidy, to cope on equal terms with any nation in the world.

So then we find that without consultation with any other interest, without regard to any other interest, the \$9,000,000 annually is to be appropriated to an overfed interest and to be put into the hands of men who, if every report is correct, are too rich to need any of the benefactions of the Government.

What is there in the contention that this bill is necessary and is constitutional because of its near relation and its benefit to the naval armament of the United States? Is there anything in the contention that the temporary cruisers into which the subsidized fast ships may be changed will be of any benefit in case of war?

Is there anything in the contention that in case of war between belligerents with whom the United States is at peace the trade of the United States now being carried in foreign bottoms will suffer? There is nothing in either contention—absolutely nothing. It is shown that the average rate of speed of our war vessels and fast cruisers is 23.4 knots per hour. We provide subsidy for vessels of over 2,000 tons and up to 18 knots, giving them an additional bounty for speed, and one of the reasons alleged is that they may be converted into cruisers for temporary purposes during a war.

Mr. President, those vessels could neither run nor fight. Everybody knows, who has ever read of naval encounters, that the advantage is in favor always of the swiftest ship, because that ship can select its own position and take its slower adversary at an advantage. We know that. We know that the foreign powers are constructing ships as swift if not swifter than ours.

The Cramps constructed, about two years ago, two war ships for the Russian navy of a very high rate of speed; and we know that the English shipbuilders for the British navy are constructing ships of at least 23 knots for war purposes. What would one of our vessels like the *New York* or the *St. Paul* or the *Paris* do as cruisers against foreign warships that can run from 5 to 6 knots faster than they can? And they are even required, like the British ships, to be built beforehand ready to carry guns, but they are only required to be converted at a moment's notice so as to carry two 6-inch guns. I believe that was the requirement in the last war for our temporary cruisers.

Mind you, we will not contend on the ocean with such a power as Spain if we ever have a war of any consequence. Spain's ships could hardly run into the water without sinking. They could not go anywhere. They were not seaworthy. They could not fight. They could not run away. They were old tubs that were unfit for naval warfare. The ease with which they were annihilated at Cavite and were destroyed at Santiago showed it.

The idea of sinking an enemy's whole fleet without losing a man shows the utter absurdity of drawing any comparison between what our cruisers did in the war with Spain and what the same cruisers would do in a foreign war with a powerful nation. It is manifest that that conclusion is absolutely absurd. The *New York*, *Paris*, *St. Paul*, and *St. Louis*, belonging to the International Navigation Company, would be perfectly useless in the matter of cruisers as auxiliary to our naval armament.

Mr. President, what about the other contention, that in case of war between two foreign powers with whom we were at peace the United States, having no merchant marine, could not transport her products in foreign bottoms?

Mr. FORAKER. Before the Senator leaves the point he has just been discussing, it occurs to me to suggest to him that this bounty, if the pending bill should become a law, is not to be restricted to ships of 21 knots, but is to be paid, as the bill was originally drawn, to ships of 21 knots or over, so that a ship of 25 knots will get the bounty that is prescribed here for one of 21 knots or over, and as it is proposed to amend the bill 18 knots or over. So if it were necessary, in order to have a useful auxiliary ship, to have it faster than 21 knots, there is not anything in this bill that stands in the way of a ship of faster speed getting the benefit of it.

Mr. CAFFERY. It is abundantly shown and testified by the hearings before the House committee and the Senate committee that no such ship as is mentioned by the Senator from Ohio will be built. Mr. Griscom, who appears to be the star witness in this great prosecution against the American people, stated that no other than ships between 14 and 17 knots will be built under the bill; that any other ships than those will not be good subsidy earners; that the very moment they get up to the point where they can carry the mails and get the speed subsidy there they will stop and will not go any further. So much for that.

Now, Mr. President, the name of Jefferson has been quoted as of great authority as favoring subsidies. I think I saw in a speech or in a magazine article by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA] a statement that all the early fathers of the country, Jefferson and Washington and Jackson, favored subsidies, and he said this in connection with his statement, that in case of a war between two powers in Europe friendly to us we would be at a great disadvantage in the matter of carrying our freight, as we would have to carry it in the ships of foreigners, and those foreigners might be in war, we would not have any ships, and therefore we would be at great extremity.

Mr. HANNA has alluded frequently to this spook of war, and tries to frighten us by conjuring up some possible future war into voting for this bill. That is one of the stock arguments of the advocates of the bill. There is not a speech made, or that has been made on the other side of the Chamber by those advocating the bill, where this matter of the terrible strait the United States would be in in case of such war, as I have mentioned, has not been dwelt upon at great length.

Mr. Jefferson has suggested in his writings the same solution of that trouble as the distinguished Mr. Chamberlain suggested in 1894. Mr. Chamberlain, by the way, is one of the members ex gratia of the unofficial, but very exalted, committee that had in charge the framing of this bill. I will read an excerpt from the writings of Jefferson to show what he thought about this matter. It is a letter to President Washington, written in 1791. It has reference to this matter, and I will read it:

The British Parliament have a bill before them for allowing wheat imported in British bottoms to be warehoused free. In order further to circumscribe the carrying business of the United States, they now refuse to consider as an American bottom any vessel not built here. By this construction they take from us the right of defining by our own laws what vessels shall be deemed ours and naturalized here, and in the event of a war, in which we should be neutral, they put it out of our power to benefit ourselves of our neutrality by increasing suddenly, by purchase and naturalization, our means of carriage. If we are permitted to do this by building only, the war will be over before we can be prepared to take advantage of it.

Now, what does Jefferson say in this matter, and what does he suggest? He says that Great Britain has put it out of our power to buy foreign ships, which would be the remedy for a state of affairs where two foreign powers were at war and we were neutral. That is what the Democratic party has been saying for over fifty years. Let us buy foreign ships. Mr. Jefferson suggests here a remedy for this evil, which is that we must buy foreign ships in a case when war is impending or before it is declared, that the way to get out of such a dilemma is to buy foreign ships.

Mr. Chamberlain backs up that as a policy not only where war is thought of or imminent, but in time of peace as a remedy for our existing evils in the matter of the paucity of ships. Mr. Chamberlain says in 1894 that this is a remedy for our existing evils; that the remedy is to buy foreign ships and admit them to the American register. I have his report here. Here is what Mr. Chamberlain, one of this conclave of eminent gentlemen who framed this bill, says in his report for 1894:

I have the honor respectfully to recommend that Congress be requested to permit the growth and development of American navigation by repealing a law enacted fourteen years before Robert Fulton's steamboat navigated the Hudson River, and a quarrier of a century before the first steamship crossed the Atlantic, when, in brief, the methods and requirements of over-sea navigation were as radically different from those which now obtain as are the conditions of land transportation to-day from those before the revolution worked by George Stevenson's locomotive in 1814.

The repeal of those portions of the navigation laws which deny American registry and the American flag to vessels engaged in foreign trade, owned by American citizens, unless built in the United States, is necessary to give to this country again any rank as a maritime power.

In 1894 Mr. Chamberlain liked to be in company with Thomas Jefferson; and perhaps his sober second thought, and in that retirement which sometimes follows a station in public life, he may regret that he ever went over into the camp where this secret conclave was

held, and where subsidies and ships were the matters under consideration. At that period instead of believing in subsidies for ships he believed in buying foreign ships and replenishing our depleted merchant marine by that means; and so has every good Democrat believed that that was the way to start the building up of a depleted marine.

So, Mr. President, these two contentions will not do. As to the matter of using these vessels, these 18-knotters, down to 12-knotters, for cruisers, it is ridiculous to talk. That matter is finally settled, as far as argument can settle it. Taking in view the speed of war ships and war cruisers, taking into view the speed and slight and weak character of the build of these fast greyhounds of the ocean, it is manifest that they will not serve as cruisers in time of war unless we want them to be easily captured by the enemy.

It will not do to raise up the specter of war and conjure that up as an argument for this subsidy theory, when, Mr. President, we could by our voluntary action to-day, by repealing those laws which prevent American registry to foreign-built ships, buy as many foreign ships as we wanted and replenish our merchant marine. Why not? What good reason has there been alleged that we should not do it? Have we not had proof before us this morning that the American owners of ships are evading our statutes by building ships to sail under the foreign flag? Do we not know that American capital is already engaged in evading these very statutes? Do we not know that English capital has largely built up our country? Do we not know that we imported iron rails to build our railroads from England when they were worth \$168 a ton?

Do we not know, Mr. President, that we have imported both the money and every material from England or the Continent that was necessary for the upbuilding of our country, except ships? Why not import ships? Why conjure up this spook of war and our terrible condition when that event comes if we can easily avoid it? There is an old law maxim which says "volenti non fit injuria." No man can be injured who seeks an injury, who is willing to be injured. If the United States is willing to sit down when the remedy is right in our hands to provide against this very contingency that is asserted as an argument why we ought to subsidize ships, sit down and fold our hands and not buy foreign ships when we can do so, then we must abide the damages, and we have nobody to complain of but ourselves.

We have nobody to complain of but the gentlemen in public life who persistently stand out in opposition to the repeal of the registry laws of the United States, laws that are so old that they ought to be classed as mummies. They are a remnant of trade barbarism. Prior to 1793 we had free ships; prior to the enactment of the Cromwellian statutes of navigation there was no restrictive legislation against purchasing ships anywhere we pleased.

Oh, Mr. President, it is all right to run your ships with English sailors, Norwegian sailors, Chinese sailors, and it is all wrong to buy the ships from England or Norway or China. Is it not better to import the ships than to import the seamen, or is there any difference? Why import a British seaman when you can not import a British ship?

Now, this spook of war conjured up has no weight or significance whatever. In the first place, we could easily have transferred over to us at a time, not suspicious, enough ships of foreigners to transport our exports to England or to anywhere else. The title would not be questioned at all, and we could by a statute admit such and such ships, as we have been doing all along in spots.

We admitted the *New York* and the *Paris*. Why can we not admit 40 or 50 or 100 more, as the exigency may demand? There is absolutely nothing in this contention; and if the yearly subsidy of \$9,000,000, which may extend to \$90,000,000 for what I know or what anybody else knows, is to be bottomed upon such a flimsy argument as that is, the good sense of the people of the United States will easily see into its weakness.

Now, Mr. President, it is contended that we can not construct ships as cheaply as they do in England or on the Continent or in maritime nations generally, and that we can not run them as cheaply, and this is held up as a reason why we should grant the subsidy. It is further stated in argument by Senators advocating the bill, notably by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce [Mr. FRYE], that the subsidy which is proposed to be given will precisely equalize the difference between the American cost of construction and the English cost of construction, the cost of running a ship by American wages and the cost of running a ship by English or foreign wages; and that the subsidy for increased speed will about or quite equalize the subsidies paid by England to her mail-carrying ships.

If their contention is true, Mr. President, that the subsidy given will only equalize an American ship with a foreign ship, then they have not provided for any increase of our merchant marine. That looks to me to be perfectly clear. If we can only run ships as cheaply as the English do, or as cheaply as the French do, or any other nation with subsidy, then the freights will be precisely the same; there will not be any difference in freights. The Frenchman

who comes over here will bring his imports; so will the Englishman, and if the American shipper exports in his ship and the Frenchman ships exports in his ships will they not just equalize?

In either case the ships will go up and down one way not loaded; in either case the marine will not be increased. There may be a swapping of the freight that now goes from our ports in foreign ships into certain American ships, but there will be no increase, there will be no greater amount of freight, and there will be no greater price for transporting that freight. If we contend that an American will export his product in an American ship, of course we must allow the contention that a Frenchman will export his product in a French ship.

Now, Mr. President, it is manifest that the contention that we will increase the merchant marine by only equalizing American ships by means of subsidy with foreign ships is utterly groundless. The slightest reflection will show it to be so, for subsidy is not going to create a surplus of product; that is certain. There are enough ships already engaged in the business of exporting our product to meet the demand for the export. One of two things will happen—either that the American exporter will export in ships of his own country or that the Englishman or Frenchman or foreigner will underbid the American and get the export freight.

If the foreigner underbids the slightest, the American ship can not run in competition; it is knocked out. It is certain that a foreign ship coming in with cargo, rather than go out empty, will reduce freights below the point that American ships can carry the same cargo.

So it is impossible to see how subsidy which only equalizes the American cost of construction and maintenance with the foreign cost of construction and maintenance can add materially to the shipping of the United States.

Now, what is there about this cost of construction? The Commissioner of Navigation. Mr. Chamberlain, says that it costs about 25 per cent more to build an American ship and about 40 per cent more to run it after it is built.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana, before he takes up that question, let me call his attention to the statement made by the chairman of the committee?

Mr. CAFFERY. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] made the same statement as to the relative cost being 25 per cent more to build a ship in this country than in Great Britain and 40 per cent more to run it. That is a controverted question. The Senator from Maine then said later:

Now, is the committee correct in its statement that it costs more to build and more to operate an American ship than it costs our commercial rivals to build and operate theirs? If the committee is mistaken in that respect, then the foundation of this bill falls through. If the committee is correct, then any Senator can see that we never will run American ships on the oceans against foreign ships until there is legislation which will equalize the difference.

I call the attention of the Senate to that because it seems to me that a very important point in this discussion is the relative cost. If the committee can maintain that there is that difference in the cost and in the running they make a strong case. I do not think it follows that we can relieve ourselves from that difficulty by this bill, by any means, but I do think, on the other hand, that if they are mistaken the chairman is perfectly correct that the bottom of this bill falls out. For that reason I hope the Senator will address himself to that very point and show what the difference is in the cost and what is the difference in the running.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, I will address myself to the important point suggested by the Senator from Colorado. The Chief of the Bureau of Statistics has lately sent out his monthly summary of commerce and finance, and in that summary he has quite a number of pages devoted to the shipping industry of the United States. I think he has furnished some very interesting data, from which we may conclude as to whether shipbuilding is as cheap in this country as it is in England. At all events, he has stated certain facts which throw a great deal of light upon the subject. At a recent meeting of engineers there were several papers read about ship construction, and Mr. W. I. Babcock, in discussing Mr. Dickie's paper, said as follows:

His own opinions regarding costs based on actual facts were derived from experiences on the Great Lakes and in the building of a class of ships which differed in many respects from those referred to in the paper and to which its conclusions were meant to apply.

As to skill in design little need be said. He would be a bold man who, in this room and before this distinguished gathering of the fraternity, would admit for a moment that America was lacking in that respect. From the days when the Constitution outlasted the whole British fleet down through the time when the American clipper ship was the acknowledged queen on the seas, to the present day, when the American's cup is still with us and the *Variag* holds the steaming record, the American designer has been at the head of the list, and no one doubts that he will remain there, no matter what new responsibilities may arise.

Mr. Dickie's opinion that at the present time the British builder has an advantage of about 10 per cent over us in the cost of material, I shall not attempt to dispute. He knows a great deal more about it than I do. In the long run, however, it seems absurd to suppose that this advantage can continue, and it seems to me not only can it be neglected now, but that we can safely count on the difference being the other way in the very near future. As a matter of fact, if we are able to ship steel to England there is hardly any reason to suppose that

through a long term of years the shipbuilders in this country will have to pay more for the same steel when they have not got the ocean freight against them. I do not think the question of material need to worry us at all in that respect.

There remains only the cost of the labor, and that is by far the most important of all. I must admit that I do not quite follow Mr. Dickie's figures here. He says that our total labor cost on a ship is 25 per cent more than the British cost, and also that the labor cost of the steel work of construction alone is about the same in both countries. With this latter statement I agree, for I arrive at the same conclusion from such information as I was able to obtain when over there three years ago. On the lakes the labor on the steel work alone of a ship is about 32 per cent of the total cost of that ship, and all other labor—painting, carpenter and joiner work, and outfit (excluding propelling machinery)—ranges from 7 per cent in a bulk freight steamer to 12 per cent in a package freight steamer, the latter meaning a boat with main deck, gangways, and hoisting machinery, and the former an ore, coal, or grain carrier.

Now, if the labor cost on the steel work is the same in both countries it is impossible that an addition of some 50 per cent to the cost of the other labor—which in any ship would be considerably less than that on the steel work, though perhaps not as much so as on the lakes—would add 25 per cent to the total labor. That is, the labor on the hull is the principal labor in a ship, and Mr. Dickie says himself that he thinks we can do that just as cheaply as they can on the other side—a steel hull. As I say, on the lakes the other labor is almost from 7 to 12 per cent of the total cost of the ship. Whatever you add to that is a very small proportion to add to the total labor.

This gentleman, appearing before this body of engineers, makes the statement that the American cost of labor is only about from 3 to 5 per cent on a ship greater than the English cost; and he states that although one of the speakers, Mr. Dickie, said that the cost of material was 10 per cent lower in Great Britain, that state of facts could not long endure with the price of steel lower in America than it was in England.

We have the authority of the Commissioner of Navigation for the statement that American steel plates have been and are much cheaper than they are in England, the difference being as between 28 for American steel plates and forty-odd for the English. Therefore, with the material that is most largely used in the building of ships cheaper here than in foreign countries, it seems to necessarily follow, as this gentleman held, that the cost of material would not long be greater in America than in Great Britain.

This is followed by other statements. Here is what the chief of the Bureau of Statistics says about the sale of American steel in Great Britain:

The largest shipbuilding center in the world is located on the Clyde. The economies of production, the capacity to meet the largest variety of demands in ship construction, and the advantages of accumulated resources of labor, of capital, and of experience, are all elements which figure largely in maintaining the prestige of this shipbuilding district. Moreover, this district is within easy reach by land and by sea of all the materials that enter into shipmaking. Being thus situated, it can supply itself with them from the least expensive sources.

It is free to get its pig iron, its steel ship plates, and its structural steel from whatever sources offer the best prices, whether from Glasgow, Middlesbrough, Antwerp, Hamburg, or the United States. If from local furnaces, the ore has to come largely from Spain. If from English furnaces, the increasing cost of coal adds a material increase to the cost of pig iron. If from foreign producers, the American manufacturer has reached the point at which he can compete with the German and the Belgian producers in the Scotch market. This is the basis on which the largest shipbuilding district in the world has to reckon in figuring on the cost of materials.

While it is true that the Clyde's characteristic industry has hitherto imported some American pig iron from the South for its shipbuilding, it has made quite generous use of American steel ship plates, in self-defense against the Scotch steel-plate makers. The effect has been, so the Scotch plate makers declare, to bring down local prices to a wholly unremunerative level at present prices of fuel and crude iron. The nominal price of Scotch ship plates early in November was \$5 per ton, net £7 12s., while the Clyde shipbuilders were quite generally working on American steel ship plates delivered at ship at £7 per ton, and even below that figure. In other words, the low-priced steel plates from the United States have actually saved the Scotch shipbuilders on the Clyde from the necessity of shutting down on account of the high prices demanded by local plate makers.

Mr. President, here are two statements, one from an authoritative source, the other from an official source, as it were, a man belonging to a body of engineers, engaged in this matter of ship construction, both of which say that the cost of construction, the one inferentially and the other directly, can not be greater in the United States for steamships than it is in England; the first stating that there would only be a difference of between 3 and 5 per cent, and the inference from the statement of the second, the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, is that the cost would be about the same; for, if we are furnishing steel plates to Scotch shipbuilders so that they can undercut in the market their brethren who get their supplies from Scotland, it is manifest that that state of affairs will soon develop the shipbuilding industry in the United States at prices as low, if not lower, than those which obtain in England.

Here is another statement by Mr. Austin:

Shipbuilding and shipping are related as supply is related to demand. Commerce calls this industry into existence and sustains its activity. Hence one reason, possibly the main reason, for the growing confidence of capital in shipbuilding is the increase in the volume of our foreign trade. American capital does not avoid shipbuilding, as is evident from the many attempts that moneyed interests have made to obtain control of the most promising yards within the past few years. As an industry, capitalists are convinced that the future of shipbuilding is assured.

There is, however, a hesitation to assume the responsibilities of the operation of ships under American registry, and, therefore, of patronizing American shipyards. Consequently American capital has to a considerable extent organized itself under foreign flags, owing to the lower cost of operation. However, this difficulty of equalizing the difference in cost of operation may be overcome. It is certain that our foreign carrying trade has assumed such proportions as to make the future prosperity of the country depend more largely than ever upon the capacity of commercial leadership to extend and maintain our markets. As this fact becomes more apparent, American investments in shipping and Ameri-

can shipbuilding must become more fully identified with one another in the prosecution of a progressive commercial policy.

At present the industrial and the commercial interests in ships are divided rather than united. This, of course, is an element of weakness in our distributive system, of which other nations are not slow to take advantage, even to the extent of encouraging American capital to engage in our foreign carrying trade under foreign registry. The extent to which this prevails may be indicated by the following figures of vessels and tonnage owned by American shipping companies under foreign flags.

Mr. Austin never stated a truer fact than when he stated that the shipbuilding interest in order to progress must be subject, and is subject, to the same causes that make any other business progress, that is the demand for ships; and he says that is increasing in the export trade. This demand for ships will go on increasing. The only reason for the hesitation of American capitalists to engage in this business is the division between the industrial interests and the shipping interests.

I can not see why that division exists or what can explain its existence in face of this demand for ships. He says there is a demand for American capital in this shipping interest and that it is already going into foreign ships. We find out that the cost of the materials that enter into the construction of ships is no greater at home than abroad; we find that there is a demand for ships; we find that Americans can build ships just as cheaply as they can be built in England. Therefore the absolute and irresistible inference is that Americans will soon build these ships.

I suppose that no one will question the evidence of a man engaged in this business. No one will suppose that a shipowner, a ship sailor, a man largely engaged in transportation over the ocean, is a bad witness; and especially if he is now building two of the largest ships in the world, or the largest ships in the world to engage in foreign trade, and that without any reference to subsidy. His testimony ought to be conclusive.

I will read what Mr. Hill says. Mr. Hill is president of the Great Northern Railroad. He is building, at New London, Conn., two vessels, each of 20,000 tons burden, to be put in the trade between San Francisco and the Orient. He has ordered these vessels built with a tonnage that will not get the speed subsidy. He has made him for carrying freight; and here is what he says:

We can build ships in this country as well and as cheaply as they can be built anywhere in the world. Now, I had figures within the last year furnished from the best builders on the Clyde, and figures from as good builders as there are in this country, and to my utter amazement the American figures on a single ship were £80,000 to £100,000 under the best Clyde builders, and when we get the ship subsidy that is promised, see how happy we shall be.

They have set apart 30 per cent of the subsidy appropriation for the Pacific Ocean. No doubt some of my friends thought they were serving me, and in a money sense perhaps they were, but I would much rather see them take the duty off the plates that are to go into ships when they are built.

Mr. President, is not that testimony conclusive? Mr. Hill was not a member of this extraordinary unofficial committee. Mr. Hill had notions that classed him as an enemy of the bill. None but the friends of the subsidy bill were invited to share in the deliberations of that extraordinary committee, and such a man as Mr. Hill, who is building the largest ships in the world to engage in one of the most important trades in the world, was not invited to be one of the members of that committee.

But manufacturers were invited, admiralty lawyers were invited, and men owning ships that are now in the foreign trade, that are established in the foreign trade, that have a monopoly in the foreign trade, were invited, but no such man as Mr. Hill. Oh, no.

Again, Mr. President, I will cite some old timers, old hands at this subsidy business. Mr. Griscom has been in it a long time, and so has Mr. Cramp. Mr. Cramp, in 1892, stated the proper question in an article in the North American Review, as follows:

The proper form in which to put the question is: "Can you build a ship to do the work of the *City of New York* or the *Majestic* or the *Columbia* in all respects for the same cost?" To that question I would reply: "Yes, or within as small a margin as would be likely to prevail in a similar case between any two British shipyards."

It is the fact that the "first cost" of ships is not only not a prime factor, but it is not even a serious factor, in any competition that may occur between this country and Great Britain for share of the traffic of the ocean.

If the current policy of naval reconstruction be pursued for another decade, till 1902, coupled with a vigorous and consistent execution of the measures recently enacted in behalf of the merchant marine, the question which forms the subject of this paper will be asked no more, unless, indeed, its point should be reversed and Englishmen be asking one another, "Can we build ships as economically as they can in the United States?"

Mr. Cramp said something more. He said:

Put the plans and specifications of the average English tramp in the hands of an American shipbuilder and he could not duplicate her. He would build a better vessel, of superior workmanship and neater finish in every respect. Under these circumstances this branch of the subject may be dismissed summarily, with the statement that an English freight ship of the usual type could not be duplicated in this country at any cost.

Here is this large shipbuilder, in an article that he wrote in 1892 for one of the prominent magazines of the country, stating that the real question is whether you can build a ship of the class of the *City of New York* or the *Majestic* or the *Columbia*, not whether you can build a tramp ship. He says, "Yes, we can build a ship of the cast and character of the *City of New York*, but we can not build a tramp ship at any price; we will not build them; we make better vessels." If Senators will look at it, they will see in the report of the Commissioner of Navigation that he has compared the cost of an Ameri-

can ship with the cost of this kind of ships that Mr. Cramp says an American will not build.

We do not build 9½-knot ships of the type of the *Pleiades* and *Hyades* in this country. We build better ships, and we shall build better ships. When we build ships to transport freight we are going to build them as large as Mr. Hill builds his ships. We do not want these 9½-knot ships. They do not carry enough freight; they are too costly. It takes as many men to run them as it does the larger ships, which carry a great deal more freight, and American money is not going to be thrown away upon these inefficient tramp ships. They carry the largest part of the freight of the world to-day, but there is an innovation coming on; there is a change going on, to be consummated by American skill and American capital and American brains.

Our tonnage is increasing year by year. On the Great Lakes we have lately launched vessels of 7,000 tons, sufficient to enter in the foreign trade or any other trade. These 2,000-tonners or 3,000-tonners have no room at all in American shipyards. We have no use for them; and it will not be long, Mr. President, in the face of all these facts, of cheaper materials out of which to construct ships, of greater ingenuity and greater skill in constructing them, with labor no more than 3 per cent higher and many more per cent greater in efficiency than that of the British—it will not be long before the American marine, unaided by subsidy, will transport at fair rates every particle of freight that the American nation can produce. When that time comes, and it will soon come, we will outstrip the world in shipbuilding and ship operation.

One point that strikes me in this debate is this: Everything shows that the American merchant marine is in a fair process of development, and it is just now, at the period of its regeneration, when a plea comes for subsidy. If that plea is granted, and if we give bounty to ships that do not need it, then it will be said that it was subsidy that built up the marine, and not the normal progress of trade.

What does Mr. Chamberlain say about our progress? It is a little tedious to read these things, but they ought to be read for a due understanding of the question.

Mr. SPOONER. It ought to lighten the tedium of the Senator to know that he is reading to a large and appreciative audience.

Mr. CAFFERY. I see an enthusiastic audience.

[At this point Mr. CAFFERY yielded to Mr. BACON, who raised the question of the presence of a quorum.]

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask to have read from page 10 of the Report of the Commissioner of Navigation for 1900, commencing at a cross on that page and going over to page 11, at the first cross.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

The total increase in our documented shipping during the decade was 740,342 gross tons. The table shows at a glance the fact already well known that the source of increase has been steel steam vessels. Analysis of the detailed figures for 1890 and 1900 will show that of the increase 422,856 gross tons comprises large steel steamships built on the Great Lakes for the freight and passenger traffic of that region.

The increase of steel steam vessels on the Atlantic coast for the coasting trade has amounted to 191,963 gross tons. The increase of steel steam vessels on the Atlantic coast for the foreign trade has amounted to 100,499 gross tons, of which 13 mail steamships of the American Line, the New York and Cuba Mail, and the Admiral Line, under the postal-subsidy act of 1891, aggregate 76,023 gross tons.

Next in importance has been the increase in barges, which for the decade amounts to 207,775 gross tons, toward which New York contributed 79,558 gross tons. The proportion of vessels ordinarily towed is larger than is indicated by the figures of the tables, as the acts of Congress create distinctions between vessels with and without motive power of their own.

A large tonnage of barges on the seaboard and on the lakes is schooner rigged, and these vessels are equipped with sails, though ordinarily towed. Following the spirit of the distinction drawn by the laws, it has been the practice of the Bureau from its organization to class such vessels as sail vessels on account of the rig. The rig, however, of such vessels is designed rather to meet emergencies than as an ordinary commercial means of propulsion.

The coasting trade of the United States, including trade with Hawaii and Porto Rico, is restricted wholly to American vessels. Its increase has been rapid and its condition is a subject for national congratulation. By natural conditions and by the laws which regulate it the coasting trade, however, is as much a matter of internal development as the growth of our railroad systems. The facts of our coasting trade can not be projected into discussions upon our share in the foreign or competitive trade by sea without leading to erroneous impressions and conclusions.

Mr. CAFFERY. I ask the Secretary to turn to page 15 of the same report, where will be found a list of thirty of the largest shipyards in the world, and to read from the points marked on the list the American shipyards as figured in that list.

The Secretary read as follows:

PRINCIPAL SHIPYARDS.

Name.	Place.	Tonnage.	Year.
Wm. Cramp & Son.....	Philadelphia.....	92,599	1900
Newport News Shipbuilding Co..	Newport News.....	67,830	1900
Union Iron Works.....	San Francisco.....	62,850	1900
American Shipbuilding Co.....	Cleveland.....	45,750	1900

Mr. CAFFERY. I desire to show by these citations that the American marine increased in tonnage for the foreign trade over a hundred thousand tons in the decade from 1890 to 1900, and that in America to-day there are four of the largest shipyards in the world. That shows that the demand which is spoken of by Mr. Austin is present. These shipbuilding establishments have not sprung up without a good cause, and it is the demand that has originated from the increased foreign trade and from the policy of our Government in building a Navy that has given rise to this impetus in shipbuilding.

I ask the Secretary to read further from page 1388 of the Monthly Summary of Commerce and Finance, beginning in the middle of the page.

The Secretary read as follows:

INFLUENCE OF THE NAVAL POLICY ON MERCHANT SHIPBUILDING.

The experience of the last seven years has enabled manufacturers of steel ship plates to bring the price of this particular material below that which rules at Middlesborough, England; so that, even though the relative cost of ship plates may only recently have fallen below the price which British and Scotch shipbuilders have to pay, the fact remains that the achievement in this one direction has been accomplished, and no one acquainted with the manufacturing industries on which shipbuilding is dependent for other materials will deny that it is only a question of time when a corresponding reduction will have been accomplished in enough other divisions of manufacture to put the shipyards of the United States on an equal footing with those of Great Britain.

Step by step our older and our newer shipyards are enlarging their scale of production, thanks to the policy of the Navy Department in distributing its contracts for war ships in such a way as to encourage the investment of capital on a large scale in shipbuilding plants. Once the scale of production has become large enough to specialize the work, so that ships can be manufactured after uniform standards which will admit of frequent repetition in constructive processes as well as in preparation of materials, then shipbuilding will be placed upon the same footing as those large industries in which the cost of production has been greatly reduced because of their admitting the repetition of typical standards of construction.

Mr. CAFFERY. I ask the Secretary to read from the report of the Commissioner of Navigation the number of ships being constructed August 15, 1900, and the capital and men engaged in the same.

NUMBER IN CONSTRUCTION ON AUGUST 15, 1900.

Name.	Capital.	Men.	Ships building or ordered Aug. 15, 1900.		Naval vessels building.		Merchant capacity.	
			No.	Tonnage.	No.	Tonnage.	No.	Tonnage.
The Atlantic Works, East Boston	\$700,000	300						8,000
The Continental Iron Works, East Boston, Mass.	100,000	500						
The Pusey & Jones Co., Wilmington, Del.								
Risdon Iron Works, San Francisco								
Moran Bros., Seattle, Wash.								
Total	800,000	800						8,000

GREAT LAKES.

American Shipbuilding Co., Cleveland, Ohio			12	45,750			27	121,500
Detroit Shipbuilding Co., Detroit, Mich.	\$1,428,000	1,300	5	13,869			6	28,000
Union Dry Dock Co., Buffalo, N. Y.	1,500,000	600	3	10,500			6	20,000
Chicago Shipbuilding Co., Chicago, Ill.	1,000,000	150					6	8,000
Total	3,928,000	2,050	20	70,119			45	177,500
Grand total	37,648,000	27,942	68	277,680	47	113,329	97	379,400

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, it appears that in the ships under construction August 15, 1900, there were \$37,000,000 of capital engaged and the number of men given in that statement, 27,000. Taking that in connection with the statement of the Commissioner of Navigation, that we are constantly increasing in our tonnage, the most marked increase being upon the lakes and, in connection with the statement of Mr. Austin, Chief of Bureau of Statistics, that every appliance and means are at hand in America for the successful building of ships, in connection with the statement that the policy of the United States is to have its war vessels built in private shipyards, thus affording abundant yards for building all kinds of ships, and taking also into consideration that the price of materials out of which ships are built is cheaper than in foreign countries, and the statement that the labor cost is only from 3 to 4 per cent greater, what does the contention of the advocates of this bill amount to that the materials for shipbuilding and shipbuilding itself and the cost of maintenance are greater in the United States than in foreign countries?

I have only had time—taken from the other duties that devolve upon me in the Senate, committee work and other work—to gather

up a few fragmentary data on this great subject, but from the data gathered and from the evidence adduced it clearly appears to my mind that the demand for subsidy is utterly groundless and has nothing to rest upon.

I will say that so far as I am concerned I believe in the radical measure proposed by Mr. Chamberlain, proposed at a time when he had not seen the light which was spoken of by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Vest]. I, for my part, stand by the theory that he proposed in days of innocence, when the serpent of subsidy had not beguiled him, and when his mind was unclouded with visions of official position.

I prefer to take him then than to take him now, and taking him then I stand where he stood in 1894—for the absolute repeal of all laws in the Revised Statutes prohibiting an American register to ships bought by Americans, or built by Americans, anywhere, in any country.

At this particular moment, when the ship industry is receiving an impetus by reason of the abundance of capital in the United States, by reason of the presence of a great number of skilled artisans, by reason of the large demand for ships for transporting purposes, I can not see any reason whatever for the grant of this subsidy.

Bounties are in line with the policy of the Republican party. That party has heretofore granted subsidies to ships, and every single subsidy resulted in disaster, ruin, bankruptcy, and one particular subsidy resulted in great scandal. The subsidy to the Pacific Mail Line, the subsidy to the Venezuelan Line, the subsidy to the Collins Line, all failed of accomplishment of the purpose for which the subsidy was given. And the subsidy to the Pacific Mail Steamship Line resulted in a scandal, the odor of which still lingers in this Hall.

Now, Mr. President, the cost of construction has been abundantly established from the documents I have read here and furnished to the Senate to be about the same in the United States as in other countries, particularly in England. The cost of operation has not been satisfactorily proved to my mind to be any greater. The Commissioner of Navigation has taken a solitary instance of one poor ship—such a one as Mr. Cramp says we will not build—and compared the cost of building a ship in America and a ship in England.

Mr. FORAKER. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. CAFFERY. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. I regret exceedingly to do so in the midst of his argument, but I understood him just now to say that it has been satisfactorily demonstrated by him that there is no difference to our disadvantage in the cost of construction or in the cost of operation. If that be true, how does the Senator account for the fact that our merchant marine is in the deplorable condition it is? What is the difficulty?

Mr. CAFFERY. I will answer the question.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me also to ask him a question, which he can answer at the same time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CAFFERY. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. If there is no substantial difference between the cost of construction of a ship in this country and abroad what good will it do for us to admit ships free of duty?

Mr. CAFFERY. I will answer both questions. The reason why American capital has not gone into shipbuilding until recently is quite manifest. We were engaged in building up the vast country that stretches, you may say, from the valley of the Mississippi to the Pacific Ocean. Immigration was pouring into that country in a constant stream. A large amount of capital was necessary to rebuild the waste places of the South. Capital to do all this was borrowed abroad. Interest was high—as high as 7 per cent. Now it is 3 per cent. Our marine is in the condition that it is because we did not start years ago on the policy of free ships. Of course, in the interim we must buy ships, but this will only be temporary, as we can and will build better ships than we can buy.

Everybody knows that our national bonds carried very high rates of interest. I believe in the early issue of bonds a good many of them stipulated for 7 per cent interest. Then we got down to 5 per cent interest, until finally, in the bonds issued in the refunding act of year before last, the interest was stipulated at 2 per cent, and those bonds ran to such a premium as made the interest on them only about 1.7 per cent. So we find that America instead of being a debtor nation is now overflowing with capital. We find that the transportation service is a remunerative service, and we therefore find that American capital is seeking that avenue.

As long as foreigners would transport our products cheaper than we could transport them there was no opportunity for the building up of a merchant marine. The very moment that we find that we have an abundance of capital at home which can be profitably employed in this line of business is the moment when we date the commencement of the regeneration of the shipbuilding interest.

We had no large shipyards years ago. We have now three of the largest in the world. We have an aggregate capital of over

\$50,000,000 in shipbuilding, and some 38,000 men, as appears from the report of the Commissioner of Navigation. I have shown that in the ships already being constructed we have some \$37,000,000 engaged and a large number of men. All this shows a new departure. I think that is a sufficient answer to the question of the Senator from Ohio.

As to the question propounded by the Senator from New Hampshire, this reply appears to me to be quite pertinent. It may be that it will take some time to bring up our shipping to the full complement necessary to transport all of our products. Pending that period, what is the harm of filling up the gap with foreign ships? None in the world. Our shipbuilding now is quite an industry. It takes a great deal of capital; and while there is sufficient capital in it to give good promise of future beneficial results and accomplishing enough to supply all the ships that we want, yet there is a gap at present; ships may not be built fast enough to supply the demand; and hence, in my opinion, it is wise to repeal the registry laws and allow foreign-built ships to register as American ships. That is a reason, and it is a good reason.

Now, at the very moment that this industry is taking on new life at that very moment it is proposed to subsidize ships, and it is proposed to subsidize them in such a way, according to the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, as will do no good. If you want to subsidize them for any purpose give them subsidy enough. You say you only give them subsidy enough to equalize them with foreign ships.

That does not take the trade from foreign ships. If you do not give them more they can not carry cheaper. If you only give them the same amount they will carry at the same rates. Who will be benefited thereby but American shipowners? The people at large will not be benefited at all. The people can only be benefited by receiving cheaper freights. You can not get cheaper freights by a subsidy that will only equalize as you say.

So this bill, even from a Republican standpoint, will do no good. You have to give and give and give until the American people will cry out to you for mercy and for a surcease of your taxes. Do not tax the country longer for building ships when it will accomplish no purpose, and do not violate the genius and spirit of our institutions, which do not provide that the money of one man can be taken out of his pocket and handed over to another as a donation.

Now, this interruption brings me back to a point that has been discussed in this body as to the constitutionality of this provision. In my own mind I have no sort of doubt that this bald, bold grant of the people's money to aid the individual enterprise, to fill the pockets of the shipbuilders and shipowners, is absolutely unconstitutional and void. That donation comes under the ban of the decision in *Loan Association v. Topeka*. It was then decided that, though the object was stated to be for a public purpose, yet if, in point of fact, it takes the money of the taxpayer and delivers it over to a favored interest or enterprise, it is robbery under the forms of law, and therefore unconstitutional.

You may tax, perhaps, for a public purpose, but you can not give away the people's money for a private purpose, and you can not obscure these provisions of the bill by placing a high-sounding title at the head of it. You can not obscure a private grant under the mask of a public purpose. It must be a purpose that reaches everywhere and embraces every interest in the United States in order to be a public purpose. It must be one that provides for the common defense and promotes the general welfare. Here you are promoting a special interest, and you do not provide for common defense in any way, shape, or form.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA] has largely built his argument upon the clause of the Constitution which authorizes taxation for the common defense. If he has shown any common defense in any one phrase of his argument I fail to see it. By no ingenuity can you turn this bill from its well-defined purpose of building up a special private industry into one that affects the general welfare of the people.

The argument of Mr. Hanley, although confronted by that phalanx of lawyers in that council of twenty-five, is just as strong and stronger than the argument of Mr. Edmunds, which was quoted to him; and when it was quoted to the poor man he said he was "up against it."

Turning again to the cost of construction of ships, I refer to the Monthly Summary of Commerce and Finance, December, 1900, and quote from it, page 1396, as follows:

SHIPBUILDING AND STEEL MAKING OUGHT TO BE COMBINED.

A prominent shipbuilder has called attention to the influence of market variations upon the position of the American shipbuilding industry in the following statement:

"Bridge building and shipbuilding are companion industries; both require similar material and similar workmanship. American bridge builders can successfully compete with the world, but American shipbuilders can not compete with their great rivals, the British, with any hope of prolonged or continued success. Why? Bridge builders engaged in foreign work are steel producers, and they regulate and maintain a uniformly low price of production for steel material; shipbuilders have to contend with a fluctuating market with no stability. Such a state of affairs is a great detriment to American shipbuilding. Steel

for shipbuilding purposes has been known to increase in price 250 per cent in four months. In Europe an increase of one-tenth of this amount in a year is unknown.

"The cost of producing steel in America is much lower than in any other country of the world, and a uniformly low price of 1 to 1.2 cents per pound ought to be maintained. At present the capacity of our steel mills and the output of our working mines is limited, so that under the present existing circumstances, as the demand for steel for shipbuilding purposes increases, so the price of steel goes upward to an impossible figure. * * * The standardizing of American machines and engines, which is the result of demand, enables American manufacturers to successfully compete with British and German producers. Give American builders the opportunities that British manufacturers have had; give stability to our steel market, and we shall then be able to successfully compete with the world."

Stability in the market of materials on which any industry is dependent may not be obtainable even were materials admitted duty free, when the world's demand for steel has raised the level of prices universally. The permanent remedy, under existing conditions, may rather be in the steel plants absorbing shipyards, or vice versa, so that the extraordinary profits which now accrue to steel industries on account of steel and armor plate sold to shipbuilders may be lumped into a single profit in the capitalization of the consolidated plants. If sworn statements of profits in steel production are to be accepted as facts, there can be no doubt that the 15 or 25 per cent difference between the cost of producing American and British ships could be overcome at once by such consolidation.

The English firm of Vickers' Sons & Maxim has demonstrated the capabilities of profitably uniting steel making, armor-plate making, and shipbuilding under a single management. No extensive steel-shipbuilding plant could permanently flourish with the vagaries of costs of material that present conditions afford. The reign of lower market prices abroad for American steel plates and shapes and of higher prices at home puts a premium on foreign shipbuilding and discourages domestic development. From this there seems to be no escape except either by resorting to the disturbing expedient of tariff revision or by conforming to that most fundamental of all industrial tendencies, the cooperation of cognate industries, to the common end of overcoming the difficulties of a speculative system of production.

It is not altogether improbable that the near future will see such conformity on the part of farseeing capitalists to the great law of costs. Already the lakes are reaping the advantage of their foresight in this direction. Ships built on the lakes now go to the seaboard in parts. The International Transportation Company have sent such vessels as the *Paraguay* and the *Anuncion* to the coast by canal to be fitted up for ocean service at the Eastern Shipbuilding Company's yards, at New London, for the tropical and the South American trade. American ships made on the lakes apparently do compete with foreign ships on the ocean, where the American ships have been made under a system of consolidated economies.

Here is a statement full of significance. He quotes a prominent shipbuilder, who says that bridge building and shipbuilding are "companion industries;" that bridge builders can compete with the world, because they, being steel producers, get their steel at uniform and low prices; that our shipbuilders, not being steel producers, are subject to the excessive demands of steel producers, whose product fluctuates as much as 250 per cent in four months. In Europe, where we sell plates cheaper than they are or can be produced there, an increase of one-tenth of this amount is unknown. Mr. Austin, Chief of Bureau of Statistics, says, in the excerpt quoted, that the remedy for this state of affairs lies either in abolishing the tariff on foreign steel plates or in the cooperation of shipbuilding and steel-producing industries.

I regard this evidence as conclusive on the cost of construction. With cheaper coal and cheaper steel the question is solved. It is a poor reason, or no reason, to say that we must pay a lot of shipowners to run ships because a lot of steel producers are charging them too much for steel, and who make, according to Mr. Austin, cheap steel for foreign shipbuilders and sell high steel to home shipbuilders.

Take off the tariff on steel, so that English shipbuilders will have no advantage of our cheap production of that article; the result will follow of having the best of ships, and a plenty of them, without subsidy.

This is a glaring instance of the folly and viciousness of levying a duty on an article, to protect it, when it not only needs no protection, but the duty cripples another home industry and benefits nobody but the foreigner.

In spite of this authoritative evidence the subsidy seekers shriek out that it costs 25 per cent more to build ships in the United States than in Europe. Mr. Hill, Mr. Babcock, and Mr. Austin all furnish convincing evidence that this is not so.

On the question of cost of maintenance and operation I assume that interest, insurance, wear and tear are the same as respects ships of the United States and foreign ships. Interest is as low here as abroad; insurance is as low, and wages of seamen as low; coal and lights are lower. The difference between American and foreign wages for firemen, greasers, and trimmers is too trifling to be the ground for subsidy. American superiority in organizing their crews, and in using ingenious devices to save labor, will more than offset any disparity between the wages of hands in the engine and fire room on an American and on a foreign ship.

The following extract from page 23 of the minority report of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries contains some valuable information on seamen's wages. It is as follows:

On the question of wages we quote the following from the Commissioner of Navigation (annual report, 1894):

"So far as able seamen are concerned, the actual competition to-day in trans-Atlantic and trans-Pacific trade is between American ships and British steamers, and a comparison of the wages paid on these two different classes of vessels will show only slight disparities in wages. Any comparison of monthly wages, therefore, unless accompanied by a full statement of all the conditions under which wages are paid and of the results attained will be misleading. * * *

"The statement is doubtless within bounds that the pay of officers and wages

of crews in the case of no foreign steamship company exceed 30 per cent of the total operating expenses. They constitute substantially the same percentage of the cost of operating steamships, increased only by the higher pay of watch officers."

The editor of *The Coast Seaman's Journal*, the organ of the organized seamen of America, says:

"Wages are equal on the vessels of all nationalities when shipping crews in any given port. In other words, it is the 'rule of the port,' and not 'the flag of the ship,' that governs wages. The usual statistics on this subject are grossly misleading."

"A change of flag to the American," says Shipping Commissioner King, of Philadelphia, "involves no increased expense either in crew's or officers' wages. Says Mr. Chamberlain, the present Commissioner of Navigation:

"The difference between American and foreign rates of wages can be, and in fact is, overcome by shipping crews in foreign ports for the round trip."

[At this point Mr. CAFFERY yielded to Mr. CHANDLER.]

Mr. CAFFERY. I have already shown that the provisions of this bill permit the employment of foreign seamen. The statement of Mr. Chamberlain in 1894, quoted in the minority report, is as true now as it was then, notwithstanding the extraordinary testimony of Mr. Nixon before the Senate Committee on Commerce. That foreign seamen will charge more on an American than on a ship of a foreign nation is incredible. I prefer the testimony of Mr. Chamberlain, of the editor of the *Coast Seaman's Journal*, and of Shipping Commissioner King, of Philadelphia.

The people are not likely to be imposed on by the plea of subsidy hunters that, under pretense of providing for the common defense by creating a body of hardy American seamen to man our battle ships in time of war, they employ none but foreign sailors at American wages. The law of supply and demand is not altered by the sentiment of patriotism or by the cunning of subsidy schemers.

I say confidently that the advocates of this measure have failed to establish two essential facts: First, that it costs more to build ships in the United States than in Europe, and second, that it costs more to operate them.

It is idle to say that steel fluctuates so that shipbuilders have to pay more for our steel than Englishmen have to pay for it. We can not give subsidy on that ground. We have the cheap steel, and if the tariff stands in the way of shipbuilders getting it at the price it is sold for abroad, do not give subsidy, but strike down the tariff.

Having failed in the main contention the subsidy advocates have failed in the other branch of their case, namely, that the subsidy will build up an American merchant marine.

I have already shown that if the subsidy only equalizes an American with a foreign ship, that the foreign ship by the slightest cut in freight rates will run us out.

It is manifest that under the terms of the bill, the present established lines and the augmentation of those lines by the subsidy which by prearrangement is to be given them, will form a monopoly of ocean carriage.

These lines are practically singled out for the sole benefit of the subsidy. They are virtually named as the beneficiaries of the subsidy. Of course, armed with nine millions a year for twenty years or twenty-five years, with a remainder over for an indefinite period, they can crush out all competition. Instead of building up an American merchant marine, contending and competing for freights, we will build up Messrs. Griscom & Co., by whose tender mercies we will be allowed to ship our products abroad. We will have a monopoly industriously created by the retroactive and prospective provisions of this bill.

Now, Mr. President, I will, by the consent of the Senate, introduce certain calculations as to what amount of subsidy the present lines engaged in foreign commerce will obtain under the Aldrich amendment, cutting down the speed mileage from 21 knots to 18 knots an hour.

The following calculation shows the subsidy to ships entered and allowed to be entered by the bill according to the Aldrich amendment:

APPENDIX I.

SUBSIDIES PAYABLE ON VESSELS BUILT AND BUILDING.

This appendix, based on the actual voyages of American and eligible foreign-built vessels for the calendar year 1899 and the probable voyages of vessels building abroad on January 1, 1900, and since that time in the United States, shows the following tonnage and compensation under the two bills:

	Tonnage.	Compensation.	
		Senate bill 727.	House bill 64.
American steam.....	255,000	\$2,200,997	\$2,083,783
American sail.....	554,000	706,000	706,000
Foreign-built steam:			
Senate bill 727.....	213,000	930,729	889,001
House bill 64.....	182,000		1,003,510
Foreign, building.....	135,000	1,026,785	
American steam (now building or contracted for).....	129,000	1,681,000	1,659,000
Fisheries.....	60,000	175,000	175,000
Total:			
Senate bill 727.....	1,344,000	6,720,511	6,516,264
House bill 64.....	1,813,000		

Changes in Appendix I, page 192, Report Commissioner of Navigation for 1900, made necessary by the amendments with reference to compensation for speed, and number of foreign vessels that may be entered by each company:

American, steam, Senate bill.....	\$1,980,109 instead of \$2,200,997
American, sail (same).....	706,000
Foreign built, steam.....	\$531,852 instead of 930,729
Foreign, building.....	\$1,009,192 instead of 1,026,785
American, steam, building or contracted for (same).....	1,681,000
Fisheries (same).....	175,000

Total..... \$6,083,153 instead of. 6,720,511

The reduction is one of \$637,358.

This calculation is based on Mr. Chamberlain's figures, page 192, report of 1900. I do not concede the correctness of Mr. Chamberlain's figures, but they show enough for the argument. They show that the present lines will absorb, under the Aldrich amendment, more than two-thirds of the nine million annual limit. Of this subsidy of \$6,083,153 the International Navigation Company gets \$1,973,383, about one-third of the whole annual subsidy obtained by all the lines, as appears by the following calculation:

SUBSIDY OF INTERNATIONAL NAVIGATION COMPANY.

Four American ships (Aldrich amendment).....	\$896,780
Four foreign built.....	213,563
Four eligible under construction abroad.....	396,600
Two under construction in America.....	466,440

Total International Navigation Company..... 1,973,383

The total for all under recent amendment is..... 6,083,153

so that under the bill as it now is before the Senate this company would receive for 14 ships one-third the entire subsidy.

The estimates given above are all copied from the report of the Commissioner of Navigation, except that for the four American ships, and that has been reduced simply from a calculation for 21 knots to 18 knots on account of the Aldrich amendment.

It thus appears that the line of which Mr. Griscom is president (Mr. Griscom being one of the 25 that framed the bill) gets one-third of the annual subsidy. In the eternal fitness of things this is right, according to subsidy logic.

On page 42 of his report for 1900 the Commissioner of Navigation shows that the ships of the Cunard and White Star lines sailing from New York received from the British Government (approximately) for both mail subsidy and Admiralty subventions the sum of \$776,156 and from the United States Government for carrying east-bound mails \$268,819, a total of \$1,044,975 for the twelve months.

These ships, a list of which is given in the report, made 100 east-bound trips from New York. Seven are as fast or faster than 20 knots.

The following is a comparison of British subsidies with American:

The service having been as good as for the corresponding three months in 1899, it is reasonably accurate to state that the British payments of \$776,156 for the twelve months ended March 31, 1900, were made for the twelve months ended June 30, 1900, and to add to that amount \$268,819 paid by the United States Post-Office in default of American steamships, making a total of \$1,044,975.

The following table shows for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1900, the mail steamships of the Cunard and White Star lines, the speed of each steamship (*Oceanic*, *Lucania*, and *Campania* exceed 21 knots, but that speed is the maximum provided for in the bill), the gross tonnage, number of east-bound voyages, and the compensation each vessel would have received for the year under the special speed rates of the Senate and of the House bill. The last column shows the additional amount on the mileage proposed to be given at rates designed to offset differences in cost of construction and operation.

British New York-Liverpool mail service.

Name.	Speed.	Gross tons.	No. of trips.	Senate bill.	House bill.	Mileage pay.
<i>Oceanic</i>	21	17,274	10	\$238,380	\$214,542	\$129,555
<i>Lucania</i>	21	12,952	14	250,194	225,175	135,996
<i>Campania</i>	21	12,950	13	232,362	209,126	126,292
<i>Etruria</i>	20	8,120	12	116,928	105,235	73,080
<i>Umbria</i>	20	8,128	6	58,524	52,672	36,576
<i>Majestic</i>	20	9,965	6	71,748	64,573	41,842
<i>Teutonic</i>	20	9,984	13	155,740	140,166	97,344
<i>Aurania</i>	17	7,269	5	18,318	16,486	16,355
<i>Germanic</i>	17	5,071	12	61,060	45,954	45,639
<i>Servia</i>	16	7,392	4	21,288	19,159	22,176
<i>Britannic</i>	16	5,004	3	10,809	9,728	11,259
<i>Ivernia</i>	16	13,800	2	19,872	17,855	20,700
<i>Cymric</i>	15	12,647	2	16,568	14,911	18,973
Total.....		130,566	100	1,261,791	1,135,612	778,787

Again Mr. Griscom's line comes to the front with nearly as much subsidy for 45 trips as the rival English line gets for 100 trips.

It was well to have Mr. Griscom as one of the twenty-five. He did not hide his talent in a napkin. More is given under subsidy dispensation to him that hath. From the taxpayer it is proposed to take the little that he hath.

General Deficiency Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. STANLEY W. DAVENPORT,

OF PENNSYLVANIA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 20, 1901.

On the bill (H. R. 14236) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

Mr. STANLEY W. DAVENPORT of Pennsylvania said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It has been my privilege to stand upon the summit of the Rigi in Switzerland and survey the prospect spread out before me. At my left, and almost at my feet, fair Lake Lucerne, and the city upon the otherside! Mount Pilatus rearing its lofty head until it reaches and passes beyond the clouds! At the right, Lake Zug and a beautiful landscape of field, forest, and mountains stretching out to the horizon, with a background in the rear of lofty snow-capped mountains!

I have stood upon the walls of Edinburgh Castle overlooking the city of churches and colleges, with all the diversity of river, mountain, and valley to charm the vision.

I have stood upon the fortress of Sterling Castle, with 30 miles of Scottish scenery before me—a picture of beauty and loveliness.

I have passed through the Gap of Dunloe and gazed upon the Killarney Lakes, nestling so softly and winding their way through mountains covered with verdure to their very tops.

I have stood entranced, overwhelmed, with the beauty of the scene before me.

But, Mr. Chairman, one does not have to cross the water to the British Isles or see the mountains of Switzerland for rare beauty and magnificence of landscape. I would like to take you to one of the ranges of the Blue Mountains of Pennsylvania overlooking the fair valley of Wyoming, famed in history and in story. There she lies, the scene of the story of Gertrude of Wyoming and the bloody massacre of 1778, even at an early day esteemed so rich in resources as to be the arcadia of settlers from Connecticut and those who had grants from William Penn. So rich and fertile were her fields that these rival claimants long struggled for their possession.

Gaze with me upon the picture! All the variations of shade and color are before you, with the beautiful Susquehanna winding its placid way through fertile lands, rich with all the coloring of a beautiful landscape, dotted with cities, towns, and villages—a picture that can not be surpassed.

Mountain, farm, and woodland! Lofty black collieries for the production of coal for market are to be seen here and there!

Such a diversity of scene is not presented in any other clime!

Here in the center of this picture lies beautiful Wilkes Barre, the capital city of the county of Luzerne and the district I have the honor to represent.

Mr. Chairman, the House having under discussion the general deficiency appropriation bill, and the opportunity being given members to talk upon such subjects as will be of most interest to their people, I take this opportunity to present my views with reference to the erection of a new Federal building in the city of Wilkes Barre, Pa.

For twenty years my predecessors have presented bills for the erection of a Federal building in our city, but we have waited in vain for the consummation of our project. In the Fifty-fifth Congress my predecessor secured an authorization of \$125,000 for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building. The United States Treasury officials advertised for bids, and in response thereto some ten or twelve proposals were submitted, but owing to the high value of the sites that were suitable for a public building in the city of Wilkes Barre, the Government declined to make any purchase and recommended Congress to authorize \$100,000 more, making the total limit of cost \$225,000.

To some members of this House this amount may seem large; but those who have visited the Wyoming Valley and have had occasion to investigate the wonderful resources and the commercial and industrial importance of the city of Wilkes Barre will not feel that this amount is disproportionate. While Wilkes Barre has a population of but 51,721, yet commercially and industrially she may be considered to have a population of 300,000. Forty minutes' ride upon the trolley brings you in contact with 150,000 people.

Wilkes Barre lies nearly in the center of Wyoming Valley, on the east bank of the Susquehanna River. The Wyoming Valley is 18 miles in length by 4 in width, and is probably the richest spot for its size upon the face of the earth. The wonderful deposit of anthracite coal makes it a territory more valuable than the diamond mines of Africa or the gold mines of the Klondike.

In fact, there is no territory in the world which approaches it in the immensity of its wealth.

Underlying a portion of the valley the sum total of the strata or seams of coal amounts to 75 feet. As it is estimated that there are 1,000 tons of coal per foot per acre, this would mean 75,000 tons of coal per acre. With coal worth \$3 per ton at the mines when prepared for market, the enormous wealth of this valley can be faintly imagined. The output of anthracite coal in the Wyoming region per annum exceeds the entire gold output of the United States nearly \$80,000,000. It is safe to say that \$10,000,000,000 worth of coal could be taken from this field and the supply would still be unexhausted.

In this region nearly 35,000 people are employed in the mining of coal. This does not include the army of men employed by the transportation companies to handle this great tonnage and the freight hauled to the mines.

We present herewith certain facts and figures showing the necessity of a public building at Wilkes Barre, the commercial and industrial importance of the city of Wilkes Barre, the assessed valuation of the real estate, the size of the city and the adjacent and contiguous territory, and such other information as seems to us to demonstrate that we should have a public building of size and character commensurate with the size of our city and its business requirements.

The county of Luzerne, of which the city of Wilkes Barre is the county seat, is almost as large in size as the State of Rhode Island, having an area of 939 square miles, while in resources and population it ranks third among the counties of Pennsylvania.

The city of Wilkes Barre is virtually the business center of a great region comprised of Luzerne County, parts of Monroe, Sullivan, Columbia, Wyoming, and Susquehanna counties, containing a population of nearly 500,000, all living within a radius of 50 miles from the city of Wilkes Barre, which is the railroad center.

This great district has no public building. The development of the postal service is such that in the not very far distant future the city of Wilkes Barre must be made the distributing center for the mails of the country embraced within the 50-mile circle. The trend of industrial development, the increase in the transportation facilities made possible by the adaptation of electricity to railways, the increased knowledge and improved devices for the mining and utilization of anthracite coal, the almost equal division of the county into mining and agricultural lands, all point to a rapid and steady increase in land valuations, and show the economy to the Government in purchasing a suitable site now and erecting a building that will be equal to the demands of the future.

The following statistics show that the county's growth and development have been steady and that it has before it a greater industrial future than any inland county in the State of Pennsylvania.

The population of Luzerne County in 1880, was 133,065; in 1890, 201,203; in 1900, 257,121. Increase in twenty years, 123,935. Population of Wilkes Barre, 1900, 51,721. In 1890 there were 44,366 registered voters; in 1895, 53,355, and in 1899, 59,456.

The steady increase in land values is plainly shown by these figures: In 1890 the value of real estate was \$157,263,343. In 1895 it had increased to \$188,525,582. In 1899 it was approximately \$200,000,000. There are 592,640 acres of land in the county, and to show that the objection can not be raised that it is a mining county and that its future depends solely on the mines, it is only necessary to look at the report of the number of acres of farming land—231,423—which, estimating their value at the low rate of \$50 per acre, would give \$11,571,150.

Its valuation of real property is greater than the valuation of real property in any one of fifteen of the smaller States of the Union. It is as great as the entire State of South Carolina. It is four times as great as the State of Idaho. It is a marvelous proposition, and so vast as to be almost incredible.

This section is traversed by the leading trunk-line railroads of the East. The Lehigh Valley Railroad, the Pennsylvania Railroad, the New York, Susquehanna and Western, the Erie and Wyoming Valley, the Delaware and Hudson Canal Company, the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad, the Delaware, Susquehanna and Western, the Central Railroad of New Jersey, and the Philadelphia and Reading (Tamaqua, Hazleton and Northern) enter this county.

The street railway system of Wilkes Barre consists of the Wilkes Barre and Wyoming Valley Traction Company and the Wilkes Barre, Dallas and Harveys Lake Railway Company, both controlled by the same parties, the entire system having 80 miles of track and reaching the suburban towns of Kingston, Edwardsville, Plymouth, Dorranceton, Luzerne, Forty Fort, Wyoming, West Pittston, Plainsville, Plains, Miners Mills, Parsons, Georgetown, Ashley, Sugar Notch, and Nanticoke, there being 225,000 people to whom transportation is afforded, and bringing the outlying towns in close communication with Wilkes Barre, or practically making a city of the whole Wyoming Valley.

The value of her municipal property is \$246,000. The city hall is valued at \$145,000, and the school district property in the city is worth \$392,168.70 and that of the county is \$625,146.63.

The city of Wilkes Barre has $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles of sheet asphalt pavement, costing about \$400,000; $11\frac{1}{2}$ miles of stone pavement, block and cobble, costing \$200,000; 7 miles of vitrified brick pavement, costing \$100,000; 50 miles of sewer, costing \$450,000.

In 1896 there were 139 post-offices in the county—1 first class, 2 second class, 7 third class, and 129 fourth class; and several new offices have been established since that time. To the majority of these the Wilkes Barre post office is the distributing office; and when this enormous business is taken into consideration, as well as the fact that the Wilkes Barre office is destined to be in the future the distributing point for mails bound to towns in Columbia, Montour, Sullivan, and Wyoming counties, the inadequacy of the present quarters is clearly apparent.

The increase in the value of real estate in a county so full of anthracite coal is not surprising when it is remembered that anthracite is found nowhere else but in that limited area in central Pennsylvania; and as the supply diminishes it will become, in the natural order of things, more and more valuable, so that delay in the matter of this appropriation means an additional expense thereafter.

There are 100,000 acres of timber lands in the county, which, valued at \$50 per acre, would make a valuation in the timber lands of \$500,000.

In 1880 the revenue receipts from this district were \$125,000; in 1895, \$245,288.10; and in 1899, \$1,846,905. I give the statement of the collector in detail for the year ending December 1, 1899:

On beer.....	\$1,169,000
On spirit stamps.....	53,624
On cigar and cigarette stamps.....	111,546
On documentary stamps.....	188,675
On tobacco stamps.....	102,612
On proprietary stamps.....	8,145
Miscellaneous.....	213,204
Total.....	1,846,905

The amount of internal revenue from Luzerne County, and which is paid into the United States Treasury through the internal-revenue office, is nearly \$1,000,000 per annum. There are 1,720 internal-revenue licenses granted for the sale of spirituous liquors. The amount of ale, porter, and beer brewed is nearly 300,000 barrels annually, so that the amount of internal revenue from this portion of the revenue district assumes vast proportions.

The city of Wilkes Barre is one of the oldest of the interior towns of the State. The story of Wyoming is familiar to all, and the growth of the city, from the old colonial days to the present, has been a steady one. It stands as a model community, a center of industry, of refinement, and wealth, one of the garden spots of Pennsylvania.

In 1880 it had a population of 23,329; in 1890, 37,718, and in 1900, 51,721, an increase in twenty years of about 125 per cent. The increase in the voting list was in almost the same ratio, there being 9,182 in 1880 and 15,176 in 1890.

The population is a steady and permanent one. An evidence of their character is shown in the bank deposits of the city, which aggregate \$10,343,732, and in the expenditures for school property, which reach the sum of \$550,000 for 20 public-school buildings. There are private schools, the property of which is valued at about \$400,000, while a fund of \$400,000 has been raised to maintain a public library. There are 43 church buildings, worth \$1,430,000.

The erection of a court-house has been recommended by the grand jury, and it has been proposed to erect a magnificent structure on the site of the present building, the value of which is placed at \$1,000,000. The county jail is estimated at \$350,000; the city jail at \$135,000; the city hospital, exclusive of site, \$80,000; Mercy Hospital, \$50,000; Ladies' Home, \$20,000; the Orphan's Home, \$40,000; Ninth Regiment Armory, National Guard, Pennsylvania, \$75,000. There are 61 hotels.

There are 403 business houses (exclusive of manufactories), 45 of which are wholesale. There are about 50 manufacturing establishments, with others in prospect. Among them are the Bamford Silk Ribbon Manufacturing Company, one of the largest manufactories in the world; the Collins-Hale Furniture Manufacturing Company; the Holmes Metallic Packing Company; Reader's Blank Book, Lithographing, and Printing Company; the Le Grande Mine Drill Company; the Hazard Wire Rope Works, one of the largest in America, capital, \$600,000; the Nottingham and Wilkes Barre lace factories, the largest in the United States, having a capital of \$500,000; the Dickson Manufacturing Company, capital \$500,000, employed in Wilkes Barre; and besides these, the Wilkes Barre Silk Mill; the Sanson Cutlery Company, one of the largest in America; the Sheldon Axle Works, the largest in America, employing over 800 hands; the Vulcan Iron Works, capital about \$1,000,000; the Wilkes Barre File Works; the Wilkes Barre Paper Company; the Dimmick & Smith Company, manufacturers of boilers; the Wilkes Barre Gun Factory; the Newell Clothing Com-

pany, and numerous planing and feeding mills, two mining-drill factories, and two large breweries.

By odds the greatest number of these industries have been commenced within the past seven years, for the reason that the smaller sizes of anthracite coal, which have heretofore been considered worthless, have been found to be efficient and valuable steam producers and can be obtained at the merest nominal figure, thus inducing manufactories to locate in the Wyoming Valley. As there are fully 200,000,000 tons of these small sizes of coal which were until recently considered worthless and are now piled up in Wyoming Valley, there is enough to supply the needs of all new manufactories which will come to the valley for years to come.

Wilkes Barre has 8 banks and banking institutions; capital and surplus, \$4,056,000, and deposits aggregating \$10,370,000. It has 4 daily and 15 weekly and semiweekly newspapers.

The steady increase of business is shown by a comparison of the reports of the Wilkes Barre office in 1895, when the gross receipts were \$58,732.07, and in 1899, when they were \$74,417.23. To show how great has been the increase, we give the statement of the receipts since 1887:

1899.....	\$74,417.23
1898.....	66,876.36
1897.....	62,063.19
1896.....	61,273.56
1895.....	58,532.00
1894.....	48,537.77
1892.....	47,392.78
1891.....	42,021.33
1890.....	40,081.47
1889.....	37,976.73
1888.....	35,648.97
1887.....	29,753.92

In 1899 the expenditures of the office were \$40,120.80.

<i>Recapitulation.</i>	
Total receipts.....	\$74,417.23
Total expenditures.....	40,120.80
Net profit of the office.....	34,296.43
Amount paid postal and acting postal clerks.....	3,910.16
Amount deposited with the assistant treasurer, Philadelphia.....	30,500.92
Total receipts, money-order department.....	316,078.46
Total receipts, registry division.....	41,797.00

The office now employs postmaster, assistant postmaster, 13 clerks, 24 carriers, 6 substitutes, and 1 collector.

And now, Mr. Chairman, why has Wilkes Barre not had a public building sixteen years ago? After I had presented our case before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds this was the question asked me by the distinguished chairman of that committee. Yes, this is the question our people have been asking for twenty years.

Wilkes Barre, in proportion to her population, is the second city in the United States in point of wealth. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds further stated that the Wilkes Barre case was one of the strongest before his committee.

That being the fact, why, then, is it that his committee recommended an increased authorization of but \$25,000, making the total limit of cost but \$150,000, when the Treasury officers recommend \$235,000? Why, again, does the committee insist upon placing a limit of cost of \$40,000 for the purchase of a site? If our case is one of the strongest before the Committee on Buildings and Grounds, why this limitation when it has been demonstrated that a desirable site can not be purchased at such a price?

A site 120 feet front on our public square could not be purchased for less than \$200,000.

Our people are not insisting on such a location. They are willing that the site should be away from the business center if kept near the population center.

The most desirable sites within two blocks of the business center can not be purchased for \$40,000. The Treasury officials are trusted in other instances to purchase sites, and why this restriction in our case? Vainly are we asking why.

I respectfully submit the report of the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress on the status of the Wilkes Barre case:

<i>POST-OFFICE, WILKES BARRE, PA.</i>	
Act of March 2, 1899, limits cost of site and building to.....	\$125,000
Original estimate for building, without site.....	135,000
As upon investigation it was found impracticable to buy a site for less than \$55,000, it has not been deemed expedient to select a site and begin operations without a further expression from Congress. As it would be impracticable to erect a smaller building than that upon which the original estimate was based, and as there has been a very marked rise in the cost of all building materials since the date of said estimate, it will be necessary, in order to satisfactorily complete the work, to extend the limit to.....	225,000

I also submit herewith a part of the report of the Committee on Buildings and Grounds upon H. R. No. 13947, omnibus bill, increasing the limit of cost of certain public buildings, and for other purposes:

The following statement indicates the different cities benefited by this bill, and shows not only the limit of cost heretofore authorized for public build-

ings in the respective cities, but shows estimates made by the Treasury Department thereon and amount of increase conceded by your committee:

Location.	Present limit.	This bill.	Treasury estimate.
Aberdeen, S. Dak.	\$87,000	\$100,000	\$150,000
Abilene, Tex.	75,000	100,000	125,000
Boise, Idaho	200,000	250,000	325,000
Brunswick, Ga.	50,000	100,000	100,000
Cheyenne, Wyo.	250,000	325,000	350,000
Cumberland, Md.	75,000	100,000	125,000
Butte, Mont.	200,000	225,000	300,000
Eau Claire, Wis.	50,000	110,000	175,000
Elmira, N. Y.	185,000	232,000	232,000
Creston, Iowa	50,000	100,000	150,000
Elizabeth City, N. C.	50,000	100,000	125,000
Fergus Falls, Minn.	75,000	100,000	125,000
Fitchburg, Mass.	100,000	125,000	125,000
Freeport, Ill.	75,000	85,000	125,000
Helena, Mont.	300,000	350,000	400,000
Jamestown, N. Y.	75,000	115,000	125,000
Janesville, Wis.	50,000	75,000	125,000
Joliet, Ill.	100,000	130,000	150,000
Joplin, Mo.	50,000	100,000	100,000
Hot Springs, Ark.	75,000	100,000	100,000
Lawrence, Mass.	100,000	135,000	200,000
Leadville, Colo.	50,000	75,000	125,000
Lockport, N. Y.	50,000	105,000	125,000
Newport, Vt.	50,000	100,000	125,000
Newport News, Va.	100,000	200,000	250,000
Norwich, Conn.	100,000	110,000	125,000
Rome, N. Y.	50,000	70,000	75,000
St. Cloud, Minn.	50,000	68,000	75,000
St. Paul, Minn.	1,050,000	1,150,000	1,150,000
Salt Lake, Utah.	300,000	500,000	500,000
Seattle, Wash.	300,000	750,000	1,000,000
Tampa, Fla.	250,000	325,000	350,000
Wilkes Barre, Pa.	125,000	150,000	225,000
Winston, N. C.	50,000	80,000	125,000
Oskaloosa, Iowa	50,000	80,000	75,000
Bristol, Tenn.	50,000	55,000	55,000
Columbus, Ga.	150,000	150,000	150,000
Carrollton, Ky.	25,000	30,000	30,000
Dubuque, Iowa	100,000	110,000	110,000
Total	5,181,000	7,140,000	8,411,000

Amount of increase asked by Treasury Department \$3,230,000
Amount of increase granted by committee 1,959,000

This increase of cost is due to a rise in the price of building material since Congress made the first authorizations. In some cases an additional increase became necessary in order to provide accommodations for United States courts, an item not taken into consideration originally, for the reason that provision had not then been made for holding courts in the cities thus affected.

From an inspection of the report it will be seen that the total increase asked by the Treasury Department is \$3,230,000.

Amount of increase granted by committee, \$1,959,000, or about 60 per cent.

Our first authorization was \$125,000. Sixty per cent increase would make \$185,000.

From these figures it then follows that if the Committee on Buildings and Grounds desired to do as well by the Wilkes Barre project as they have done in the average case, they would have recommended the average increase, which is 60 per cent of the Treasury recommendation, or \$185,000.

But, Mr. Chairman, \$150,000 was deemed to be adequate. When the omnibus bill gets before this House I sincerely trust the bill will be so amended as to give us \$200,000, and the provision limiting the cost of the site be stricken from the bill.

The Agricultural Bill.

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM H. KING,
OF UTAH.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 30, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10638) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. KING said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: My purpose in addressing the committee is to invite attention briefly to a growing evil which is manifest in much of the legislation of Congress. I refer to the constant invasion by the National Government of the field of State and individual effort. There are many provisions of this bill that are obnoxious to the letter of the Constitution and violative of its spirit. I suppose I should preface my remarks with an apology to members for mentioning the Constitution. I have discovered that even to some Democrats the charter of our liberty is not so important as an appropriation for their home or State. If one

attempts to discuss a proposition from a constitutional standpoint, members will declare that he is becoming academic, and that in this practical age a "business" interpretation is to be placed upon the organic law.

I am reminded of an observation made by a distinguished Republican, not now in the House. His words were: "Whenever we (speaking of the Republican party) want a bill to pass, it is constitutional; if we do not want it passed, it is unconstitutional."

This is most dangerous doctrine, and yet it finds disciples everywhere in our land. It is heterodoxy that will, if unchecked, destroy the orthodox faith established by those who gave us the Republic. Instead of loyalty to the ancient creed, there is endeavor upon every hand to escape its prohibitions and evade its requirements.

This is an age of transition. The march of physical science and the marvelous achievements in the realm of human knowledge have engendered a spirit of unrest which manifests itself oftentimes in contemptuous bearing toward the interdictions of our Federal charter.

This spirit pervades this legislative hall and finds expression in the unrepentant, undemocratic, and unconstitutional measures so often enacted into law.

If the provisions of the Constitution are too palpably clear to afford ground for quibbling as to their meaning, then it is boldly contended that conditions have arisen which can not be controlled by the Constitution. So we find honorable Senators and members arguing that the President is above the Constitution in dealing with Porto Rico and the Philippine Archipelago, and that neither of the tripartite divisions of our Government is amenable to the Constitution in many of the important policies now being pursued. We are constantly advised that this is a "sovereign nation," and that in virtue of this sovereignty all powers which European nations possess belong to this. No longer is this to be a Government of delegated powers, and it is "academic" and "old fashioned" to talk about the reserved rights of the States and the people.

An unconstitutional act has a demoralizing effect upon the whole people. If in our relations to the Filipinos or the Porto Ricans we disregard fundamental principles, we will ignore constitutional requirements at home. If we distrust the organic law in one thing, we will grow to distrust it in many concerns. If we can evade it to-day by indirection, to-morrow we will defy it openly. There is nothing so deadly in its effects as a compromise with error. The high standard of morals (the observance of which alone can bring human perfection and happiness) in governments is essential if nations would endure and the people prosper.

The spirit of paternalism is seen in this bill. It provides for soil surveys in the various States, the distribution of seeds to the people, and for enterprises which are wholly of a personal and local character.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the provision just read, which appropriates from the Federal Treasury, for "soil investigations" and surveys, not upon public lands, but within the States and upon the farms and fields of individuals. If the General Government is to undertake the monumental work of analyzing all the soils of the farms in all the States and Territories, and preparing maps, drawings, colored charts, etc., of the same, then the appropriation should be somewhere near commensurate with the magnitude of the work.

Mr. Chairman, the impertinencies of the officials of the Government are becoming unbearable. No sooner is a department created than the employees must be doubled and quadrupled. During the last Congress more than five thousand new offices were created by Congress. After the list of employees is enormously increased then the demand comes from them for an increase of salary. They organize, and send lobbyists to secure legislation. Then new bureaus must be provided, with more employees and higher salaries. To warrant the demands made upon Congress for their increases the officials persistently encroach upon new fields.

A geological department is organized. To increase its importance it makes valuable surveys, such as a railroad would undertake. It prints formidable maps, showing every little stream and country lane in the United States. This and other work were contemplated, requiring more officials, more bureaus, more and higher salaries. And so the departments and divisions and bureaus and subdivisions and classifications multiply and breed, until they hide the very machinery of the Government with their unnumbered hosts.

The Agricultural Department is organized. Then follow numerous divisions and bureaus, which in turn are divided and then subdivided. A soil bureau or division is created, with higher salaries and, of course, more employees. Of course an analysis of soil will require a "chemical soil bureau." So we may see in the next Congress the Committee on Agriculture besieged by employees of the soil bureau, who will insist that the magnitude and importance of the work committed to them require the formation of

another bureau. It is natural that each employee should desire to head a bureau, and of course it will follow that the agitation will be for more bureaus. Next it will be indispensable, in order to carry on the excellent investigations of the Department, to have a "microscopical" bureau, for how else can the bacilli and the minute forms of animal life be discovered? And so officialdom gathers force and power as it increases in numbers.

It is notorious that the employees of the Government become more insistent each year. They demand higher salaries, less duties, more privileges, speedier promotion. They prepare bills, dictate legislation, and regard Congress as the mere automaton to register their desires and provide for their demands.

This country is suffering from the curse of bureaucracy. I have heard hundreds of distinguished and prominent persons, many of whom are Senators and Congressmen, say that the work now being done in Washington by the Government bureaus, departments, etc., could be performed for one-fourth of the expense. Many employees, protected by the civil-service rules, are more concerned in drawing their salaries than in performing honest and faithful service.

When positions are insufficient to meet the growing appetite of the people, additional ones are created. It is notorious that this Administration has added to the salary list of the Government, outside of the military establishment, many millions of dollars. Commissions have been created and new offices have been carved out to give place to the thousands of hungry Republican ward heelers, parasites, grafters, plunderers, and harpies who honorably and dishonorably aided in perpetuating in power the trust-ridden, subsidy-bound, un-American Administration now ruling this people.

Mr. Chairman, what right has Congress to appropriate money for the examination and analysis of soils upon the lands owned by private individuals?

I understand that it is the purpose of the Agricultural Department to prepare elaborate colored maps, diagrams, and charts of all the cultivated lands within the United States. That in order to do this detailed examinations and costly and numerous experiments are to be conducted in every locality. Scientific experts and specialists are to be employed by the Government, and they are to visit the farms in all the States, conduct experiments thereon, and publish the results of their labors. Mr. Chairman, valuable as such researches and experiments are, there is no power in the parent Government to undertake them.

Why should the Government go upon the farms of the people and analyze the soils? It is claimed that by so doing the people will be advised what crops their lands are best adapted for.

If this be conceded, the unanswered question still confronts us. Where is the authority of the Federal Government to engage in this paternalistic work?

It is possible the General Government might have the authority to examine the public lands with a view to determining what price to set upon them when they are offered for sale, but the proposition that it may aid people in their private business by telling them how to farm, how to sow and reap, how to analyze the land and eradicate the deleterious elements therefrom is so clearly beyond the province and power of the Government and so repugnant to every precept and canon of interpretation that I can not understand how it can secure a single supporter.

Mr. GAINES. Does it not benefit the general public to get that information?

Mr. KING. Then comes my friend with the "general-welfare" proposition. All manner of national sins are committed under the commerce clause and the general-welfare provision. How easy it is to argue that the public will be benefited by taking money from the National Treasury for some State or local purpose. It is the argument in favor of bounties and prohibitory tariffs and all the unconstitutional and paternalistic measures enacted by Congress. I will grant for the moment the contention of my friend that the general public receives the information resulting from such experiments.

Does my friend mean to argue that the constitutionality or propriety of a legislative act is determined by the question as to whether the public derives advantage or benefit or information therefrom? If that be the rule, why not have Congress publish the schoolbooks for the people and build their schoolhouses and employ their teachers?

Why not supply the farmers with agricultural machinery, the people with their clothes and houses? In fact, under such a view, could not the people seize the Federal Government, its machinery, its Treasury, and employ them for every enterprise, work, undertaking, or object which in any manner contributed to their material welfare or their intellectual advancement?

If, my friends, argument is to prevail, I do not see any reason why the Federal Government should not go into every department of human activity and help the individuals who are working therein; it could go into the carpenter shops, into the mining camps, into the schoolrooms; it could go into every department and avenue of human endeavor and make investigation and inquiry with a

view to the betterment of the condition of the people and to the advancement of education.

Such a proposition seems to me little less than monstrous. It destroys the States, overturns the Republic, and creates an oligarchy or tyranny—at least a government of unrestrained power.

Mr. GAINES. I would remind the gentleman that schools are State institutions; a State need not have any schools unless it chooses; that is not a matter coming within Federal power; it is a State right to have school or not, as the State may choose. So the Supreme Court recently decided in a case from Georgia. But does the same principle apply to the soil of a State? Suppose that the United States Government should undertake to experiment on the land of A, not for the benefit of A only, but for the benefit of the whole United States as a matter of general information. I do not know whether the gentleman's construction of the law is correct or not. I have not investigated the proposition of law critically. You may have. This question I would like to hear you discuss.

Mr. KING. I think the gentleman is correct in perceiving a difference between the National Government controlling the schools in the States and analyzing the soils of the private lands within the States; but after all, is not the difference rather in degree than in abstract principle? Congress can not control the schools of the people, because they are domestic and local matters inseparably connected with the municipal government of the States.

Neither can the Federal Government control the private lands within the States. My friend's position is, as I apprehend him, that Congress is prohibited from legislating for the schools, but is not restrained from conducting a national school to teach the people how to farm.

I ask, gentlemen, what difference in principle can be discerned between appropriations by Congress in aid of State schools and appropriations to employ teachers and scientific persons to study geology and chemistry and soil analyses upon the private lands within the States with a view to teaching "grown-up children" how to profitably operate their private concerns?

The former, I opine, would be regarded by my friend as unconstitutional; the latter a proper exercise of Federal power. I would denounce both as unconstitutional and so paternalistic as to be subversive of our form of Government if applied in the daily affairs of the people.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GAINES. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] be extended for five minutes.

Mr. KING. I may not occupy that much time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAINES. I wish to ask the gentleman from Utah—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman from Utah, under unanimous consent granted yesterday, is entitled to fifteen minutes whenever he may choose to occupy the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah has stated that he requires only five minutes, which the Committee of the Whole has granted. He has said he does not know that he will occupy all that time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. But I wanted to make it clear that the gentleman, under unanimous consent already granted, is entitled to fifteen minutes if he chooses to take it, so that there is no necessity for the granting of another unanimous consent.

Mr. KING. I appreciate the courtesy of the House in extending me that time in my absence.

Mr. GAINES. The gentleman from Utah has evidently given some study to this question, and therefore I desire to ask him a question or two. Does he hold that the Government has no right to distribute seeds to farmers, as is now done under the law? If it has that power, where does it get it? And if it has the power to distribute seeds, as is now done, has it not the right to follow the seed down to the land upon which it is planted and examine the soil for the public information? In order that it may fully benefit the farmer, has not the Government the right to say, "We will examine this soil. We have given you the very best seed we could; and now we want to ascertain the best fruits that can be realized from that seed. Turn us loose on your farm for a while and we will analyze your soil. You may plant this, that, or the other seed as you please and we will watch the results."

Has Congress the right in the first place to give the seed; and if it has, then in the second place has it not the right to go down and examine the soil on which the seed is planted?

Mr. KING. The two questions of my friend show the dangerous extremities to which his philosophy leads us. If Congress can give the seed, why not plant it? And if it can plant it, why not examine the soil, and then why not water the seed and the soil, and cultivate the land and harvest the crop? In short, why not do anything that the owner might do? And then why not take charge of the land and then employ the owner? And thus you have a gigantic piece of socialism resulting from centralized and unauthorized power.

If the Government has the right to do what my friend perhaps intimates that it may do, I see no reason why the Government has not the right to furnish individuals a certain kind of brick and stone and mortar and lumber for the construction of his house, upon the theory that the Government is making investigation as to the best kind of building materials and mortar—that which is most impervious to the elements; that which will best stand the ravages of time—and after the Government has thus furnished various materials, which through investigation conducted by its bureaus or other subordinates has been ascertained to be superior, I see no reason why the Government should not then build houses for such persons.

Why could not the Government say, "We have shown by investigation that a particular variety of lumber is best suited for certain climatic conditions; that mortar containing described constituents is incomparably superior to all other kinds; that a particular quality of stone becomes more adamant by exposure to the elements, and that, for the purpose of demonstrating the truth of our observations and investigations, we purpose building you a house." Thereupon it constructs the house for Mr. "A." Then why not for Mr. "B." And after having constructed the house, I see no reason why the Government should not take care of it. It seems to me that under the logic of my friend from Tennessee the Government may go into every department of life and help individuals in their private enterprises, in all their industrial occupations.

Mr. GAINES. Can not the gentleman draw this distinction: Everybody knows how to build houses. I could build one myself, albeit it might not be artistic, yet it would do to live in. A great many honest men have lived in houses less artistic than I could build. But that is not the matter to which I challenge the gentleman's attention. The point I make is this: This Agricultural Department, under the gentleman's view of the law, would be an unconstitutional Department. We would have no right to maintain it.

I do not agree to that. But if we have the right to maintain such a Department, have we not the right to give it means to effectuate the purposes for which it has been created—that is, to distribute seed and to get the benefit from scientific investigation as to the product of such seed—not for the benefit of A, or B, or C, but for the benefit of the people in general? Here is a Department established for experimental purposes. We know that the building of houses is not a question of experiment in this country; nobody is talking about that. This is a scientific bureau that has the right to exist under fundamental law, and if so, it seems to me it has the right to go to the extent necessary to effectuate the purposes of its establishment.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, my friend does not draw proper distinctions, nor does he reach proper conclusions. He says everybody knows how to build houses. I think the gentleman is incorrect. Certainly there is as profound a knowledge of agriculture as there is of architecture among the masses of the people. There is much yet to be learned concerning the proper sanitation of houses, how best to heat and light them. There is so much of "scientific" knowledge connected with the erection of buildings that architects are employed to prepare the plans and superintend the construction. As a rule, as my friend will know, farmers do not employ scientific men to teach them how to farm. Butter-making and the manufacture of cheese are appendages to the farm. Skill is required, as well as a knowledge of chemistry to produce a superior product—certainly as much skill as is needed to analyze the soil. Why should not the Government send instructors to teach the making of butter and cheese?

And I would ask, Mr. Chairman, if because the Government furnishes seed to the farmer, whether it would have the right to go upon his land and inform him that it had come to make an analysis of the soil? If it possessed that right, it could go further and say to the individual, "Having furnished you seed for your farm, we now propose to analyze the soil on your farm, and show you how to irrigate your land. We have made investigations and conducted experiments, and find that you do not irrigate your lands properly; that you ought to irrigate by some subsurface system instead of by the overflow system, or that you should irrigate by a new method recommended by our experts, instead of the one employed by the practical farmers of the section."

I agree with my friend. If the Government supplies seeds, why not see that they are planted properly—which involves the duty of teaching the people not only soil analysis, but all of the multifarious questions directly and remotely connected with the great science of agriculture? It embraces the important subject of irrigation, the building of dams, and the storage of water for irrigation purposes.

What right, Mr. Chairman, has the Federal Government to go out upon the farms of the people—the farms of individuals throughout our country—and analyze the soil? What right has the Federal Government to take the money of the people from the Federal Treasury and go into the purely private matter of furnishing general information to the people upon subjects that exclusively be-

long to individual enterprise? Doubtless investigations might be made in a thousand different directions, and in various avenues of business conducted by the people, and would be productive of good and would add to the sum total of human intelligence. But to the extent the Government engages in this work private effort and State enterprise lag, and finally the Government will be called upon to do that which clearly rests upon the people. If it were true that this was a proper function of the Federal Government, then the Federal Government ought to become a mighty landlord, a father to the people. It would be required to supply work, feed and clothe and house its citizens. Such a policy would discourage private endeavor and personal aspiration.

The gentleman asks, why, if we have an Agricultural Department, we should not give it means to effectuate the purpose for which it was created?

Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know fully for what purpose this Department was organized, but I will say, that if the object was to teach paternalism, I regret that it was brought into existence. If this Department can find nothing to do but invade the province of State and individual effort, it is time some one should teach it its proper sphere of activity.

The gentleman is incorrect in assuming that my position leads to the conclusion that the act organizing the Department was unconstitutional. I can see much that can be done by this Department without subjecting itself to the criticisms I have offered.

But I certainly can not assent to the doctrine that because an institution or department has been created it necessarily follows that its labors and works are proper.

Mr. Chairman, the farmers of this country are the greatest sufferers from the evil system of paternalism. They bear the burdens of our nation. They toil and labor; they build the houses and workshops and railroads and banks and ships, and upon them rest the stability and security of our country. They have never been the beneficiaries of unjust and discriminating labor. Tariff laws and bounties have enriched the favored classes, but the agriculturist has been compelled to discharge the obligations created in behalf of the favored ones.

The expenses of war, the obligations of the Government in times of peace, are met by the farmers of our country. When I denounce class legislation and special privileges and paternalism, I am speaking in the interest of the farmer and the laborer. They are not here to plead for themselves—they are not here asking for special legislation. The banker, the capitalist, the so-called "business man," the bondholder and stockbroker, and railroad speculator—all are here, and their demands, tumultuously made, are speedily granted.

Now is the time to defend old-time Democratic principles—to renew allegiance to the cardinal principles of human liberty.

Never in the history of our Government was the task of the Democratic party more arduous, nor has there ever been a time when the necessity for the ascendancy of Democratic principles was greater. Now is the time to preach the creed of Jefferson and Jackson and to return to those beneficent teachings the triumph of which can alone preserve the Republic. Democracy is crying to the people to return to the path of safety. It sees the Temple of our Fathers desecrated by the horde of mercenaries who make merchandise out of human liberty and the principles of free government. It sees the Republic filled with greed and a spirit of commercialism, which is always incompatible with high ideals and humanitarian conduct.

It finds combinations of men and capital bent upon prostituting the powers of the Government to advance their private ends; and the very altars around which our fathers bowed are used as counters upon which to rest their unholy gains.

Special legislation has filled the land with trusts and a parvenu aristocracy. The Republican party protects the evil brood which it has created. Arrogant, haughty, and tyrannous, it rules the people. It has by its improper legislation created a power that is menacing the nation.

Mr. Chairman, some people see the unrest of the people and say that socialism occasions it. I want to tell such persons that discontent and unrest and socialism always follow periods of special and unjust rule and legislation. They are the progeny of class legislation which enriches the few and despoils the many of the power which rightfully is theirs. If wealth is bestowed upon the few by unjust laws, if power is centralized in the hands of a class who degrade the Government for their own aggrandizement, then it will follow, as the "night the day," that those who have been denied the equality of law will demand redress and reform even if socialism triumphs or revolution ensues.

The people only want their rights—equality before the law, equal opportunities in the race of life. They can be trusted.

It is the rich—the rich who have perverted the Government to secure their wealth; the proud and aristocratic, the organizations of capital to destroy labor and private enterprise—that can not always be trusted.

The heart of the masses beats in sympathy with the great march

of human liberty and progress. They desire to ever abide in the temple of humanity and fraternity.

The party of the people, the party of liberty, of brotherhood, of equality, is now fighting the great battle which in all the centuries has ceaselessly been waged.

Repeal of War-Revenue Taxation.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN C. BELL,
OF COLORADO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, December 13, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 12394) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898, and to reduce taxation thereunder.

Mr. BELL said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The war-revenue bill could well be further reduced if Congress would lop off the many barnacles that are fastened upon the body politic for political purposes.

A saving could be made in the District of Columbia without injury to the public service that would relieve numerous necessary articles of the pestiferous war-revenue tax.

On February 18 I introduced in this House a resolution that indicated some of the extravagances in the District, and which resolution reads as follows:

House resolution No. 421, Fifty-sixth Congress, second session.

Whereas the public press generally of the city of Washington stated at the time or times hereinafter mentioned that on or about the 30th of February, 1897, Hon. Hoke Smith, Secretary of the Interior, did turn over the Pension Office to a private committee in the city of Washington, known and designated as the inaugural committee, whose purpose was to entertain the public for three days after the inauguration of the President of the United States, and which committee did move from the first and second floors of said Pension Office to the basement and third floor and into a temporary building constructed upon the outside the furniture of said Pension Office and over 300,000 files of pension claims; and that the said committee did decorate and keep possession of said building until the 7th day of March, 1897, and did give a grand inaugural ball as an entertainment to the public, after said inauguration, at which those present were required to pay said committee \$5 each; and that said committee did give in said Pension Office a grand concert, for which each person attending paid a liberal entrance fee for the purpose of bearing the expenses of entertaining the public during said three days; and after the said expenses were paid the said committee, according to its report, had a surplus of more than \$8,000, which it, according to said report, paid to the charitable institutions of the District of Columbia; that no part of said committee's work, organization, or supervision was in any way official; that between 1,500 and 2,500 regular employees of the Government in said Pension Office, examining and allowing the pensions of old soldiers of the Mexican, Indian, and civil wars were given leaves of absence while said private committee had possession of said building, and were on pay amounting to more than \$7,000 per day, which said absence was not charged to the annual vacation or sick leave allowed by law to such employees, but that they were, according to the public statement made by Hon. D. I. Murphy, then Commissioner of Pensions, paid the sum of \$70,000 while idle; and the said Murphy did, after said 7th day of March, 1897, declare to the public press that such letting of said Pension Office was a great damage to the Government in breakage, disorganization of forces, and in the delaying of the allowance of pensions to old soldiers, in addition to the cost of \$70,000 paid to idle employees, and he recommended that such building should not in the future be allowed for such purposes; and

Whereas the daily Evening Star of this city, a most reputable paper, did on the 15th of February, 1901, publish the following statement:

"It will cost the Government \$25,000 in salaries alone to hold the inaugural ball at the Pension Office, and \$10,000 in incidental expenses may be added to this. On February 27 the Commissioner of Pensions will turn over the building to the inaugural officials, and it will not be until the morning of the 7th of March that the clerks will return to their desks. It will be several days after that before the big machinery of the Bureau will be running smoothly. * * * Two clerks of the Pension Office were discussing the situation to-day as a reporter on the Star went through. One of them said, 'Of course, I am glad the ball is going to be held here this year, for it means nearly ten days' holiday, but it will cost the Government nearly \$50,000, and really I don't believe in such extravagance.'"

"Extravagance, indeed," replied the other, 'you only look upon one side of the ledger. How about what the Government saves in pensions during that time? Figure that out and strike a balance, and I venture the Government will not be found to be much the loser.'"

"* * * It is a shame, then, to keep the old soldiers from getting their pensions directly. I am going to bring this matter to the attention of my post, and I will bet you things will be different four years hence;" and

Whereas the Pension Commissioner did write to the author of this resolution on January 16, 1901, among other things:

"The appropriation for clerical hire in this Bureau for the present fiscal year is \$1,971,210, which represents an outlay of about \$5,400 per day."

And he further says the force turned off will cost the Government \$5,000 per day, and that the committee now organized, similar to the one organized in 1897, will have this building eight days, and that the clerks will be allowed their pay, and that the time they are so allowed pay will not be charged to their annual vacation or sick leave allowed by law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is most respectfully requested to inform the House of Representatives if it is true that the Pension Office has heretofore been turned over to such inaugural committee and the clerks given leaves of absence at the expense of the Government, not charged to their thirty-day annual vacation or to their sick leave as allowed by law; and if it is the intention of the Secretary of the Interior to allow to such inaugural committee the use of the Pension Office as set forth in said Evening Star report, or at all; and if it is the purpose to allow the employees leaves of absence on full pay or otherwise, and not charged to their annual vacation or sick

leave; and if so, under what claim or legal right have such leaves of absence been allowed under pay or are they intended to be allowed by the Secretary of the Interior in February and March, 1901?

I made one unfortunate mistake in this resolution, and that is in using the name of Hon. Hoke Smith as Secretary of the Interior and charging that he let the Government Pension Office to a private inaugural committee, when, as a matter of fact, he had resigned before this was done and his successor had been appointed and is responsible for this usurpation of power.

I take this opportunity simply to correct this mistake as far as it lies within my power, and here announce that the Hon. Hoke Smith had nothing to do with this usurpation.

The United States now Spends Annually for Military and Naval Purposes Many Millions More than Any one of the Great Military Powers of the World.

SPEECH

OF

HON. C. F. COCHRAN,
OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 13, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 14018) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes—

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I know that whenever a protest against the appalling growth of public expenses in recent years is raised, the defenders of profligacy, extravagance, and even worse things invariably retort that the country possesses vast resources and inexhaustible wealth; that it is growing with marvelous rapidity; that the people do not feel the burdens imposed by Federal taxes, and so on to the end of a chapter of explanations which, in my opinion, fail utterly to explain. It is true the country possesses vast resources, but this does not justify unnecessary public expenditures.

It is true some of our people possess vast wealth, but the wealthy classes do not bear their fair proportion of the burdens imposed by the extravagance and jobbery which are swelling the public expenses to figures so appalling, and are not distressed by the payment of taxes as are their poorer neighbors. If it be true that a few are enormously rich and many in affluent circumstances, it is also true that a much larger number of our people are not wealthy, many of them are very poor, and upon the vast majority the burdens of taxation fall heavily indeed. I know full well, Mr. Chairman, that during the years in which the aggregate of Federal expenditures have grown larger and larger the excuses to which I have referred have seemingly been received by the people as sufficient, but certainly this session's extravagance will not be condoned. The day of retribution—long, too long delayed—is at hand.

This Congress before its expiration March 4, in the two years of our incumbency, will have appropriated for the two fiscal years expiring July 1, 1901 and 1902, at least \$1,500,000,000. Will the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber attempt to justify this prodigious increase by saying the country is rich, the country has vast resources, the country is growing rapidly?

The expenditures for 1891 and 1892 aggregated only \$710,797,235.93, less than half the sum appropriated by this Congress. Have the taxpayers generally doubled their possessions during the past ten years? What magician's wand has doubled the resources of the country during that period?

In 1891, in making provision for the expenses of the fiscal year expiring July 1, 1892, the Congress appropriated less than \$400,000,000. Now we, ten years later, in providing for the year expiring July 1, 1902, will appropriate nearly \$800,000,000.

The appropriation bills of this Congress provide for expenditures during the coming fiscal year far in excess of our expenditures during the fiscal year expiring July 1, 1865—the most expensive year of the great civil war, when we had 1,200 ships on the sea, maintaining a blockade from Galveston to the Chesapeake, and a million men in the field engaged in military operations, the most stupendous the world has ever witnessed.

In the presence of these significant figures, I declare, Mr. Chairman, that the pending bill forms a part of a budget the most extraordinary that ever was presented to the consideration of the American Congress, or any other parliament or council invested with power to control taxation and public expenditures in a great nation.

I am aware that the figures show that the expenditures for the fiscal year expiring June 30, 1865, aggregated a billion and two hundred millions; but it should be borne in mind that at that time we used only paper currency, worth, in specie, less than 50 cents on the dollar. So that if the obligations of the Government had been discharged in gold, as they now are, the appropriations for that year would have aggregated about \$600,000,000.

To the end that there may be no controversy on this point, I

submit the official table, prepared by the Treasury Department, showing the average gold values of our paper currency during the years in which we used paper currency only. This table is relevant not

only to the comparison I have just instituted between this year's appropriations and those made in 1864, but to what I am about to say concerning public expenditures generally.

Table showing the average value in gold of \$100 in currency in the New York market, by months, quarter years, half years, calendar years, and fiscal years, from January 1, 1862, to December 31, 1878, both inclusive.

Period.	1862.	1863.	1864.	1865.	1866.	1867.	1868.	1869.	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.
January.....	97.6	68.9	64.3	46.3	71.4	74.3	72.2	73.7	82.4	90.3	91.7	88.7	89.7	88.9	88.6	94	97.9
February.....	96.6	62.3	63.1	48.7	72.3	72.8	70.7	74.4	83.7	89.7	90.7	87.6	89.1	87.3	88.2	94.8	98
March.....	98.2	64.7	61.4	57.5	76.6	74.1	71.7	76.2	88.8	90.1	90.8	86.6	89.2	86.6	87.5	91.4	98.8
April.....	98.5	66	57.9	67.3	78.6	73.7	72.1	75.2	88.4	90.4	90	84.9	88.2	87.1	88.5	94.2	99.4
May.....	96.8	67.2	56.7	73.7	75.9	73	71.6	71.8	87.2	89.7	88	85	89.9	86.3	88.8	94.9	99.3
June.....	93.9	69.2	47.5	71.4	67.2	72.7	71.4	72.4	88.6	89	87.5	85.8	90	85.4	88.9	94.8	99.2
July.....	86.6	76.6	38.7	70.4	66	71.7	70.1	73.5	85.6	89	87.5	86.4	91	87.2	89.4	94.8	99.5
August.....	87.3	79.5	39.4	69.7	67.2	71	68.7	74.5	84.8	89	87.4	86.7	91.2	88.1	89.9	95.2	99.5
September.....	84.4	74.5	44.9	69.5	68.7	69.7	69.6	73.1	87.1	87.3	88.1	88.7	91.2	86.4	90.9	96.8	99.6
October.....	77.8	67.7	48.3	68.7	67.4	69.7	72.9	76.8	85.7	88.3	88.3	91.8	91	85.9	91.2	97.3	99.6
November.....	76.3	67.6	42.8	68	69.5	71.6	74.4	70.2	89.8	89.9	88.6	92.1	90.2	87.2	91.7	97.3	99.8
December.....	75.6	66.2	44	68.4	73.2	74.2	74	82.3	90.3	91.5	89.1	90.9	89.6	87.8	92.6	97.3	99.9
First quarter year....	97.5	65.2	62.9	50.4	73.3	73.7	71.5	74.7	84.9	90	91	87.6	89.3	87.6	88.1	94.8	98.3
Second quarter year....	96.3	67.4	53.6	70.7	73.6	72.7	71.7	73.2	85	89.7	88.6	85.3	89	86.3	88.7	94.2	99.3
Third quarter year....	86.1	76.8	40.8	69.8	67.2	70.8	69.5	73.7	85.8	88.4	87.6	87.8	91.1	87.2	90.1	95.6	99.5
Fourth quarter year....	76.6	67.2	44.9	68.4	70	71.8	73.7	79.4	89.6	90	88.7	91.6	90.2	86.9	91.8	97.3	99.7
First half year.....	96.9	66.3	57.9	58.9	73.5	73.4	71.6	73.9	86.4	89.8	89.8	86.4	89.2	86.9	88.4	94.4	98.8
Second half year.....	81	71.6	42.8	69.1	68.6	71.3	71.5	76.5	87.7	89.2	88.2	89.4	90.7	87.1	90.9	96.4	99.6
Calendar year.....	88.3	68.9	49.2	63.6	71	72.4	71.6	75.2	87	89.6	89	87.9	89.9	87	89.8	95.4	99.2
Fiscal year ended June 30.....		72.9	64	49.5	71.2	70.9	71.5	72.7	81.1	88.7	89.4	87.3	80.3	88.8	87.8	92.7	97.6

I desire to call attention also to a table which appeared recently in the Philadelphia North American, showing the per capita expenditures of the Federal Government each year from 1837 to 1901:

Year.	Net expenses.	Per capita on expenditures.
1837.....	\$37,243,496.00	\$2.36
1838.....	33,865,059.00	2.10
1839.....	26,899,128.00	1.62
1840.....	24,317,579.00	1.42
1841.....	26,565,873.00	1.51
1842.....	25,205,761.00	1.39
1843 (6 months).....	11,858,075.00	1.27
1844.....	22,337,571.00	1.16
1845.....	22,937,408.00	1.15
1846.....	27,766,925.00	1.35
1847.....	57,281,412.00	2.71
1848.....	45,377,225.00	2.08
1849.....	45,051,657.00	2.00
1850.....	39,543,492.00	1.71
1851.....	47,709,017.00	1.99
1852.....	44,194,919.00	1.78
1853.....	48,184,111.00	1.88
1854.....	58,044,862.00	2.20
1855.....	59,742,668.00	2.19
1856.....	69,571,026.00	2.48
1857.....	67,795,708.00	2.34
1858.....	74,185,270.00	2.49
1859.....	69,070,977.00	2.26
1860.....	63,130,598.00	2.01
1861.....	66,546,645.00	2.08
1862.....	474,761,819.00	14.52
1863.....	714,740,725.00	21.42
1864.....	865,322,614.00	25.42
1865.....	1,297,555,224.00	37.34
1866.....	520,809,417.00	14.68
1867.....	357,542,675.00	9.87
1868.....	377,340,285.00	10.21
1869.....	322,865,278.00	8.55
1870.....	309,653,561.00	8.03
1871.....	292,177,188.00	7.39
1872.....	277,517,963.00	6.84
1873.....	290,345,245.00	6.97
1874.....	302,633,873.00	7.07
1875.....	274,623,393.00	6.25
1876.....	265,101,085.00	5.87
1877.....	241,334,475.00	5.21
1878.....	236,964,327.00	4.98
1879.....	166,947,894.00	5.46
1880.....	287,642,958.00	8.34
1881.....	260,712,888.00	5.08
1882.....	257,981,440.00	4.91
1883.....	265,408,138.00	4.91
1884.....	244,126,244.00	4.44
1885.....	260,226,935.00	4.63
1886.....	242,483,138.00	4.22
1887.....	267,932,179.00	4.56
1888.....	267,924,801.00	4.46
1889.....	299,288,978.00	4.88
1890.....	318,040,710.00	5.07
1891.....	365,773,905.35	5.73
1892.....	345,023,330.58	5.30
1893.....	383,477,954.49	6.78
1894.....	367,525,279.83	5.43
1895.....	356,195,298.29	5.16
1896.....	352,179,446.08	5.01
1897.....	365,774,159.57	5.11
1898.....	443,368,582.89	6.97
1899.....	605,072,179.85	8.14
1900.....	487,713,791.71	6.39
1901-1902 (estimated).....	1,500,000,000.00	20.00

It will be noticed that for the first year of the civil war, the year expiring July 1, 1862, the expenditures were \$474,761,819, in paper currency.

In gold these expenses could have been paid with about \$420,000,000; the expenditures for the fiscal year expiring July 1, 1863, \$714,740,725, could have been paid with about \$423,000,000 in gold; for the fiscal year expiring July 1, 1864, \$865,322,614, \$435,000,000 in gold would have paid the bills; and in the last and most costly year of the great conflict a little over \$600,000,000 in specie would have paid the expenses of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I cite, with the mere suggestion of its relevancy, another basis of comparison by which we may arrive at instructive deductions. Want of time forbids its extensive discussion. The defenders of the extravagant expenditures of the two years and the still greater profligacy contemplated in the future would have us believe that a complete explanation is found in the greatly increased cost of war—growing out of improvement in arms, explosives, and equipments. The fact is that while heavy artillery and machine guns cost more, small arms cost less than they did thirty-five years ago, and in many respects military operations, like everything else, have been cheapened by modern means of manufacture, transportation, etc., just as similar expenses of individuals have declined.

Drop out of the account every dollar expended for modern arms and explosives, and still the unexplained and unexplainable fact remains that in maintaining an army of 100,000 men we are expending many millions more than are necessary—far more than any one of the great military powers of Europe expends in the maintenance of its army.

Mr. Chairman, in support of this assertion I submit a table showing the military and naval expenditures of the great powers, with timely comments, which appeared a day or two ago in the Philadelphia North American. I think the correctness of these figures will not be questioned:

\$200,000,000 A YEAR THE COST OF IMPERIALISM TO UNCLE SAM—THESE FIGURES SHOW THE COST TO UNCLE SAM OF GREED FOR THE ACQUISITION OF TERRITORY.

	Army.	Navy.	Pensions.	Total.
United States*.....	\$170,000,000	\$78,000,000	\$144,000,000	\$392,000,000
Great Britain.....	115,000,000	135,000,000	15,000,000	265,000,000
France.....	127,000,000	57,000,000	26,000,000	210,000,000
Germany.....	127,000,000	15,500,000	15,000,000	157,500,000
Russia.....	147,000,000	34,000,000	19,000,000	200,000,000
United States, 1895.....	25,000,000	25,000,000	151,000,000	199,000,000

* Estimated from the latest available figures. The totals credited to foreign countries are for the year 1900.

ESTIMATED EXPENSES FOR MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT NEARLY DOUBLE THOSE OF EUROPEAN POWERS.

The military budget of this Republic for the coming year will be nearly \$400,000,000, nearly twice what any great European power is spending.—Senator HALE, of Maine, in the United States Senate on Thursday.

The note of alarm sounded by the New England statesman is no "cry of wolf." Official figures bear him out.

Imperialism has led the American Congress into a course of amazing extravagance.

Great Britain, with 200,000 soldiers in the field of South Africa, with the tremendous cost of transportation and supplies, with the expenses of aggression and defense in her remote colonies, pays for her military establishment in time of war \$127,000,000 less than the United States in time of peace.

France and Russia pay nearly \$50,000,000 less than England. Germany \$50,000,000

less than France and Russia. Yet all these powers support larger armies than the United States. Great Britain's force in all is fully 500,000; Russia's, 761,000; Germany, 591,000; France, 561,000, and the United States, 105,000.

Imperialism will cost the United States \$200,000,000 this next fiscal year. That is to say, in 1895, before the Spanish-American war had infused the lust of conquest into the Administration's body, the total military budget, including Army, Navy, and pensions, was \$199,000,000. Now it is \$392,000,000. Moreover, although the pension disbursement in 1895 was \$7,000,000 more than the present list, the total cost for defense has almost trebled.

In that year the sum expended for pensions was more than \$100,000,000 in excess of that for Army and Navy combined, whereas at present it is just about half the total for the two departments, and \$30,000,000 less than Army alone.

The accompanying detailed table of figures will show perhaps more clearly how timely is Senator HALE's warning.

In this table the expenses of navies, as well as of armies, and the military pensions paid by the various countries are included. Leaving out of the account naval expenditures and pensions—to which I have not hitherto referred—it will be observed that, taking this year's budget as a criterion, we may expect that as long as we keep up the rôle of "a world power" we must expend for military purposes annually a sum very much larger than is expended by any of our competitors—\$55,000,000 more than Great Britain, \$43,000,000 more than France, \$43,000,000 more than Germany, \$23,000,000 more than Russia.

Including both military and naval expenditures, we must expend only \$2,000,000 less than Great Britain, \$64,000,000 more than France, \$105,500,000 more than Germany, \$76,000,000 more than Russia. Add pensions to the war budget and we must expend \$127,000,000 more than Great Britain, \$182,000,000 more than France, \$234,500,000 more than Germany, \$93,000,000 more than Russia.

Mr. Chairman, these figures are eloquent. They tell us that the business of a "world power"—the business of sending armies to distant lands and waging wars of conquest—is expensive. Laying aside all qualms of conscience—leaving out of the account every consideration sounding in good morals—throwing to the winds the restraints presumably imposed by our past professions of abhorrence for despotic forms of government—putting aside the solemn duty devolved upon us by the nature of our relationship with the Philippine army prior to the capture of Manila—let us submit this accursed policy to the test applied to transactions at the bargain counter. Does it pay?

Mr. Chairman, I think I have proven by official figures, conclusively, that the prodigious increase in public expenses is attributable almost wholly to militarism. The money raised by the imposition of extraordinary taxes is expended in carrying on military enterprises entered upon by the President practically upon his own responsibility, and in forwarding these enterprises, he and his satellites have scattered the contents of the Government cash box with such prodigality that already we are at the head of the list of "world powers" in point of expenditures; which would seem to render it certain that while our rivals may make money by butchery and conquest, we will lose money as well as character and conscience by engaging in the business.

Whereas until recently it was the boast of Americans that they were exempt from the burdens imposed upon the people of the Old World by the maintenance of vast armies, the mad policy of the Republican Administration has, as in the twinkling of an eye, saddled upon Americans, permanently, annual military expenditures larger than those of any other country in the world.

Mr. Chairman, the fact that the expenditures of the current fiscal year will be the largest in the history of the Government and that next year the aggregate will be still larger is calculated to refresh the recollection of the people and cause them to go back on the trail of the Treasury raiders. The billion-dollar Congress was the most significant feature of Mr. Harrison's Administration. Mr. McKinley will go down into history with the distinction of having at his back a Congress so malleable that he had no difficulty in ushering the billion-dollar session; for before the war in the Philippines is over that mad enterprise, together with largesses sure to be voted to the steamship combine and other kindred jobs, will surely swell the yearly expenses to that figure.

The jingoes are in the saddle, and the country must pay for it. Immunity from deserved punishment has emboldened the Republican majority in Congress, and campaign obligations are to be paid out of the Treasury with never a fear that the party responsible for the malfeasance will be called to account. A few days ago a Republican Congressman said to me: "Why, the people care nothing about the Federal taxes. They don't know they are taxed by the Federal Government. The tariff, the tax on tobacco, the tax on liquors—they pay these taxes, of course, but they don't know it, or at least they don't feel these taxes like they would if they paid them directly."

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that indirect taxation, while no less exacting than direct taxation, does relieve those responsible for tax laws and public expenditures of the danger of odium which unquestionably would relegate them to private life if the people fully comprehended the extent to which they are pillaged. But, sir, I do not believe that when the taxpayers find that on the heels of the bil-

lion-dollar Congress comes the billion-dollar session the party responsible for this enormous budget can take refuge behind the fact that the money thus ruthlessly sown broadcast is extracted from the pockets of the people by the stealthy, but no less ruinous, system which we are told leaves them with depleted purses yet ignorant of the fact that they have been robbed.

I have heard it said also that the Democratic party makes a tactical mistake in advocating retrenchment and economy. It is said liberal appropriations are popular with the people, and I have even heard it said that liberal appropriations help make good times.

Mr. Chairman, if this position be tenable then why not double or quadruple the taxes, to the end that we may double or quadruple the expenditures and thereby double the measure of general prosperity. If high rates of taxation and extravagance in spending the money realized augments the general prosperity, then verily a business millenium is at hand.

Another palliative is the statement that the country is so prosperous that the people can afford to pay higher taxes, and that they are content to place at the disposal of the President sums larger than are expended by any of the European monarchs, to be used in winning for the United States, by the same means employed by the marauding, land-grabbing nations of the Old World, superlative distinction as a world power.

I grant you that on account of good crops at home and bad crops abroad a favorable balance of trade has enabled us to replenish our stock of money, and increased money supply means higher prices and better times. As long as we hold this vantage ground taxes will weigh less heavily upon the people, but it should be borne in mind that if this country has had its eras of prosperity it has also suffered commensurate eras of depression and gloom.

If "good times have rendered the burdens of taxation relatively light," bad times have rendered them grievously oppressive. Has it never occurred to gentlemen who have fastened upon the country permanently a rate of expenditure necessitating in time of peace the imposition of taxes never before resorted to except in time of war, that when once the financial pendulum, now swinging far in the direction of prosperity and development, shall swing the other way—as certainly it will, sooner or later—the people will scourge from power not only the party, but the individuals responsible for policies which have led logically to this frightful enhancement of the expenses of the Government?

Mr. Chairman, it is evident that Democrats are not alone in viewing with apprehension the evils to which I have referred. Statesmen and politicians high in the councils of the dominant party see, in the mad extravagance of this Congress, portents of the impending storm. In a colloquy which occurred in the Senate between two distinguished Republican Senators a few days ago (Senator ALLISON and Senator HALE), both, I believe, members of the committee that there has charge of the general appropriation bills, it was agreed that the expenditures this year would reach \$780,000,000, and that in addition to this sum we might expect large deficiency bills to cover unpaid bills sure to be contracted during the coming fiscal year, which will swell the total for the coming fiscal year to fully \$800,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, let not the consciousness of immunity from deserved chastisement for past offenses obscure the tremendous import of these figures. The limits of forbearance are being passed. Such inroads upon the substance of the people mean ruin. The industries of the country, thus oppressed, can not thrive and go forward in healthy development.

In estimating the gross sum of taxes borne by the people, it should be borne in mind that in addition to levies for the support of the General Government the citizen is taxed to support the district school and to pay the expenses of the town, the village, the city, the county, and the State. He is taxed by the church. His contributions to public and private charities are in the nature of taxes. He is taxed by the trusts. The fixed charges that prey upon his revenues are sweeping away year after year a larger portion of his earnings than is necessary. Notwithstanding these numerous demands, our citizens are content if the impositions are necessary—if the money is devoted to defraying necessary public expenses. But, Mr. Chairman, again I ask the Republicans on this floor, what additional advantages or benefits are conferred upon the taxpayers in return for this additional taxation? None whatever. The authors of the existing tax laws—the party leaders responsible for these unparalleled expenditures—know that for the most part the increase is in the military and naval appropriation bills. They know that policies now being pursued will inevitably lead to further increase in these items, and also to a considerable increase in the pension roll.

And, Mr. Chairman, in this connection I want to call attention to the necessity, which sooner or later will be generally recognized, of differentiating the pension roll of the future from the pension roll which now calls annually for about \$145,000,000. We are paying this sum to the surviving volunteer soldiers of the great civil war,

to men who left their farms, their shops, their stores, and their offices, and in the hour of peril to the nation risked life and health in the camp and on the battlefield.

If we are to adopt the European policy of militarism—maintain a large standing army and employ it in wars of conquest waged for profit—can we treat professional soldiers as we have treated the citizen soldiery of the Republic? Now, let no one dare to say that I would belittle the services or the valor of our soldiers in the Philippines.

I do, however, declare that nations that carry on wars of conquest have not adopted the generous pension policy observed by this Republic in requiting the services of the volunteer soldier; and I do say that if they had done so the business would not have been profitable; and I do say that, now that this country has joined the European land grabbers and proposes to substitute a great standing army for the volunteer soldiery which heretofore have fought its battles and won for its arms imperishable renown, one of the questions to be answered is, Are you going to continue the policy which now awards to the survivors of the Union Army annually pensions in the aggregate almost equal to the military pensions bestowed by Russia, Germany, France, Austria, Italy, and Great Britain combined; or are you going to imitate other great military empires and treat your soldiery as mercenaries, who choose the profession of arms as a means of livelihood, who prefer the profession of arms, with all its dangers to life and limb, to the peaceful avocations of private life?

I raise this question knowing how quickly the suggestion may be seized upon by the spellbinder and the demagogue and made the text of vapid declamation as to the valor and merits of the American soldier, whether regular or volunteer, but I invite gentlemen to stick to the question in hand. I again inquire whether the taxpayer is to find in an ever-increasing pension list and larger and larger military expenditures his sole and only compensation for the hard-earned dollars that are to be wrung from him by increased taxation?

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the great standing Army with which we are to conquer and forcibly govern colonies and dependencies 10,000 miles distant from this capital will not be for any considerable period composed of such men as have formed the volunteer armies of the United States in the past. American manhood of the nobler sort will not take kindly to service in an army which fights battles at frequent intervals in which "the enemy" lose two, three, and four hundred killed, and one, two, or three wounded, with the loss of one or two killed and a dozen or twenty wounded. Mr. Chairman, is it war or murder by wholesale the incidents of which are chronicled in the dispatches sent by the commander of our forces in the Philippines?

Sir, I declare that if our great standing Army is to be thus employed it will not be made up of the heroic type of American manhood which rendered immortal the fame of the volunteer armies commanded by McClellan, Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, Thomas, Lee, Jackson, Longstreet, Johnston, and Beauregard. It will not be recruited from the farm, the store, and the countingroom.

Mr. Chairman, in the name of my country and its traditions I protest against converting our Army into an aggregation of mercenaries. I protest against the programme which we are told must be followed in order to keep pace with those world powers which in every decade of the past century have shamed the name and disgraced the professions of Christianity.

I declare that with the solitary exception of the war for the liberation of Cuba, no righteous war has vexed the peace of the world during the past fifteen years. Whether we consider the assault of the Italians upon the independence of Abyssinia, happily defeated by the overthrow of the invading army, or the bloody crusade of the British emissaries upon the Upper Nile, or the assassination of the South African Republics, or the destruction of the liberty of the Filipinos, or the invasion of China by the allied armies of Europe and America—at the bottom of each of these tragedies is lust for spoils.

The animating cause of all these wars is the determination of the strong to forcibly override the weak, and the motive of the wrongdoers is conquest, plunder, spoils. At the elbows of princes and presidents, in the councils of ministers, are the speculator and the "promoter" inciting wars having no purpose except the subjection of the natural resources of conquered countries to exploitation upon the bourse, to the end that the Barney Barnatos of two continents may build fortunes upon foundations laid in the debris of desolated homes and cemented with the blood of slaughtered peoples. What excuse can the Christian nations offer for any of the wars of the past decade?

Did Great Britain send Kitchener and his army of butchers to the Upper Nile to punish an enemy or avenge an insult? Had the Soudanese tribes done aught to injure Great Britain? Had they offended Her Majesty Queen Victoria or her Government? No; their destruction formed part of the programme mapped out by Cecil Rhodes and his stock-jobbing London partners. It was the fact that the possession of their country was essential to the realization of the dream of a British empire in Africa extending from Cairo to Cape Town that marked these nomads of the desert for slaughter. Was it because the Filipinos had injured the people of the United States that

President McKinley instructed our representatives to make the purchase of their country a feature of the Paris treaty, paving the way for their subjection to a government of force?

Who doubts that it was the sinister influence of the stock exchange that sent the British army to South Africa upon a mission the most cruel and mercenary that is recorded in the annals of modern times.

Had Abyssinia assailed or threatened Italy? When Germany seized a Chinese port, Russia another, and England another, and France another, each with considerable tributary territory densely populated, thereby subverting the domestic control of millions of the inhabitants of the venerable Empire, was it a fair reprisal for wrongdoing on the part of China? Had the Chinese Government been guilty of some offense justifying invasion and conquest? No. China's only crime was the possession of natural resources worth stealing, and the same is true of other bloody frays which for a decade have filled the world with sorrow and bloodshed.

In the mountains of China are gold mines. Large areas of the country are underlaid with coal. There is an opportunity to do there what has been done in Europe and America—reduce to the possession of a mere handful of men the natural treasures of the country, "capitalize" them, sell stocks and bonds on the stock exchange, establish monopolies of coal, iron, steel, and petroleum—in short, an opportunity to steal and exploit the natural resources of the Chinese Empire.

Mr. Chairman, were any of these bloody crusades entered upon in response to a popular demand for these wars of conquest? Is it true that anywhere in the world the people who bear the burdens and fight the battles of nations have shown a desire that war should be waged against the victims of these crusades? No. The soldiery of Christendom are in the field fighting the battles of the money changer and the stock jobber. The politicians and rulers who sent them forth on this hideous errand, obeying the instigations of the spirit of avarice which everywhere controls the judgment of the lawmaker, the scepter of the ruler, and sometimes even the ministers of religion, are cheek by jowl with adventurers and desperadoes, who thrive by the means which gave to England Rhodes and Barnato, are in every country under the sun placing similar talent in control of politics and government. Sir, is it not amazing that an American President should constantly declare that their sole motive is the promotion of progress, their only purpose the propagation of piety, their only desire the uplifting of humanity?

Murder and robbery wear the mask of Christianity, the agencies of destruction are declared to be the enginery of progress. Shame, shame, shame upon the brazen hypocrisy! Mr. Chairman, if Christianity is symbolized by the marshaling of conquering armies under the flag of the pirate and the plunderer; if the nations that sit in darkness are to learn religion from the money kings of the stock exchange, whose messengers bear in their hands, not the cross, but swords dripping with the blood of murdered innocents, then the story of the Nazarene is not told aright in Holy Writ. It is time to quit this masquerading. Let us doff this disguise and at least be honest enough to confess that what the historian has heretofore called the Christian powers have turned freebooters, thieves, and oppressors.

Sir, if we could find in the whole world no more hopeful picture of progress than is seen in the bloody deeds of mercenary armies; if Christianity confessed no higher ideal than the appetite for plunder which has incited these sinister enterprises; if the Christian virtues, in full play, found no higher interpretation than is revealed in the lives and works of the Christian statesmen and Christian sovereigns responsible to God and mankind for these atrocities; if the regeneration of the planet is dependent upon such ministrations, then may just men exclaim in despair, "Religion is a mockery, Christianity is a delusion, God is dead." [Loud applause.]

Mr. Chairman, with shame be it said that the American armies now in the Far East are not guiltless. Our soldiers have been guilty of participation in the wholesale robbery of the households of Peking, showing that thus early in our career as a "world power" we have taken more than one lesson in crime from our coparceners.

I hold in my hand a paper to which I invite the attention of this House and the country. If the statements contained in this paper are true—and they emanate from a gentleman of more than national reputation, and therefore I believe them to be true—then there is, somewhere in the United States, a gentleman living in a fine house which has within its walls the evidence that our soldiery in Peking have been guilty of deliberate violation of the laws of war, and the historian of the future will set down against us crimes which never before tarnished the fame of an American army. Mr. Chairman, this paper is calculated to enlighten us as to just what the Army which costs us so many millions is doing. It shows us precisely what is required to keep up our reputation as a great world power.

I will ask the Clerk to read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

JAMES CREELMAN SAYS LOOTING GOES ON AT HOME AND ABROAD.

I have just seen a box of glittering loot from Peking. Priceless green jades from the imperial palace, marvelous chains from the necks of unwilling mandarins,

rare vases from the throne room itself. As I looked upon the heaped treasures of the conquered Chinese capital—gleaming and glowing in the sunlight of an American city—a question came to my lips:

"Surely the American army took no part in the looting of China?"

The American citizen who showed me the precious plunder laughed.

"Our soldiers were nearly as successful as the others," he said, "although they were more discreet."

He lifted a jar of milky jade and two delicate white jade Chinese pens. Then he raised a snowy slab of carved jade, the like of which is not to be seen outside of a Chinese palace.

"These," he said, "are the writing set of the young Emperor."

Then he held up a vase of ancient ruby glass, shaded into a wonderful green, as when the sun shines through a maple leaf in the springtime.

"This I got beside the throne of the old Empress. It seemed to me the most beautiful thing I had ever seen when I first beheld it. It was made centuries and centuries ago."

Next came a sheet of dull-green jade—pictured, emblazoned, and lettered in gold.

"It is the cover of a book of Confucian poems engraved on antique jade. It came from the Imperial palace, too."

I have traveled in many lands, and my journeys in Asia have made me familiar with the wonders and beauties of Chinese art. But never had I seen more beautiful things.

"Our officers were loaded down with loot," said my friend. "Nothing was taken from the Imperial palace until the allied armies marched through. Then the officers went to the palace and were entertained by the palace officials. I saw thousands of costly objects, but it never occurred to me to touch them until I saw the officers of every nation pocketing vases and gold ornaments. It was an extraordinary sight. Every stranger in the place was a guest. The officers ate dainty food and drank choice tea served by the Chinese officials, while they walked about, stripping the palace of its artistic treasures. I saw one man taken a huge dish of solid gold, trample it flat, point his pistol at the head of an Imperial eunuch and compel him to carry it away for him."

"And the American officers took part in this work?"

"They all took part. No nation was free from it. The whole province of Pechili was looted."

"But the Americans—are you quite certain of it?"

"Of course, I am. I saw them carry off loot in every town and city they touched. Why shouldn't they?"

"President McKinley would hardly give countenance to the plundering of a helpless nation by American soldiers."

"What! With the ship-subsidy bill before Congress?"

There it is. How gloriously the spirit of empire spreads! Provinces burned, palaces plundered, women outraged, unarmed men slaughtered. This is the distant side of it. And how can a nation that looks placidly on far-away scenes like these object to a little looting of the national treasury at home?

There may be a difference between the plundering of Chinese cities by our officers abroad and the subsidy paid on the public funds in Washington, but the distinction is to be found only in the name and the method. If there are no rights which a conquering soldiery is bound to respect, what rights is a victorious political party in the United States bound to regard? Vae victis! It is a cry as old as the human race. Loot at both ends of the line! Plunder the palaces of China frankly and picturesquely, but use soft-sounding oratory and swell high the note of sentimental national pride when you put your hand in the pocket of an American taxpayer.

Pile on the millions. Overwhelm all records of legislative profligacy. Make it a billion and a half dollar Congress. Cast the expenses of war times into the shade by the extravagance of peace times. Be a world power. But remember that it costs money.

After empire comes want. Hunger stalks in the shadow.

"And though mine arms should conquer twenty worlds,
There's a lean fellow beats all conquerors."

We who live in Washington are not easily shocked by the idea of looting. Usage hardens the heart. And so a lovely snuff bottle of green jade from the Forbidden City rests on the mantelpiece of the room in which I write almost every day about the ship-subsidy bill.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this arraignment appeared in the New York Journal a day or two ago. It is in line with similar revelations made by letters from private soldiers who took part in the Pekin campaign which have appeared in the newspapers. I take it that no one will deny that the operations of the allied armies in China have been characterized by a degree of brutality in comparison with which the bloodiest deeds of savage warriors seem quite respectable. Thank Heaven no accusation couples our soldiers with the horrible atrocities committed by their European associates. But the Creelman letter just read, as well as voluminous corroborative testimony which doubtless has fallen under the eye of the members of this House, leave no room to doubt that the soldiers of the allied armies helped themselves to everything worth the stealing found within the walls of Pekin, and that commissioned officers were as guilty as the rank and file.

Now, if this be true, some pertinent questions arise. Are we at war with China, or is China a friendly power? If we are at war with China, who published the declaration of war? If we are at war with China, and the baubles described in Mr. Creelman's letter are the legitimate spoils of war, to whom do they belong—to the gentleman who displays them in his private residence, or to the Government? Have soldiers serving under the American flag, and even officers who command them, so soon learned the lesson of brigandage from the example of the soldiers of more experienced "world powers" that already they pillage households, denude palaces, and carry off the spoils as private plunder?

Mr. Chairman, in the Congressional Library is a unique public document. I have been told the copy in our library is the only one extant. It is entitled "Barbarities of the enemy." It is the report of a committee appointed by this House to investigate and report upon violations of the usages and laws of war practiced by the British soldiery in the war of 1812.

At this juncture this quaint little volume is particularly interesting. It contains voluminous evidence going to show that in our second struggle for independence "the mother country," our "kinsmen

across the sea," the "world power," with which the Administration seems to have formed a partnership, practiced upon Americans precisely the atrocities which have characterized the campaign of the allies in China. The report of the committee, which I will have read presently, and the evidence upon which the report rests, tells us that the British soldiers, in traversing the country between the mouth of the Chesapeake and this Capitol, invaded farmhouses, maltreated women and children, carried off bric-a-brac, jewelry, and other valuables, and mutilated and destroyed what they could not carry away. Of course these violations of the laws of war are severely denounced, and the committee, very justly, condemns with unstinted bitterness commissioned officers of the British army who were guilty of this misconduct.

The report tells us also that the village of Hampton, Va., was given over to sack and pillage after the manner of mediæval times, and that imprisoned Americans listened to the wails of outraged wives and daughters unable to go to the rescue. All this happened when the infant Republic was at war with one of the great "world powers." Brutality, dishonesty, savagery—these are the prime attributes of soldiery engaged in the service of the conqueror. It always has been so. It always will be so. The ideals of the soldier as to his duties may fall below—they never can rise above—the ideals of his country. If conquest and plunder are the shibboleth under which he fights, pillage and plunder, not the glory and honor of his country, will inspire him. It was, I say, the soldiery of a "world power" and their officers who perpetrated the awful crimes narrated in this report.

The committee to whom was referred that part of the President's message which relates to the spirit and manner in which the war has been waged by the enemy report that they have collected and arranged all the testimony on this subject which could at this time be procured. This testimony is submitted to the consideration of the House, under the following heads:

First. Bad treatment of American prisoners.

Second. Detention of American prisoners as British subjects on the plea of nativity in the dominions of Britain, or of naturalization.

Third. Detention of mariners as prisoners of war who were in England when the war was declared.

Fourth. Compulsory service of impressed American seamen on board British ships of war.

Fifth. Violation of flags of truce.

Sixth. Ransom of American prisoners from Indians in the British service.

Seventh. Pillage and destruction of private property on the Chesapeake Bay, and in the neighboring country.

Eighth. Massacre and burning of American prisoners surrendered to officers of Great Britain by Indians in the British service. Abandonment of the remains of Americans killed in battle or murdered after the surrender to the British. The pillage and shooting of American citizens, and the burning of their houses after surrender to the British under guaranty of protection.

Ninth. Outrages at Hampton, in Virginia. The evidence under the first head demonstrates that the British Government has adopted a rigor of regulation unfriendly to the comfort and apparently unnecessary to the safekeeping of American prisoners generally. It shows also instances of a departure from the customary rules of war by the selection and confinement in close prisons of particular persons and the transportation of them for undefined causes from the ports of the British colonies to the island of Great Britain.

The evidence under the second head establishes the fact that, however the practice of detaining American citizens as British subjects may be regarded as to the principle it involves, such detentions continue to occur through the agency of the naval and other commanders of that Government. It proves, too, that, however unwilling to allow other nations to naturalize her subjects, Great Britain is disposed to enforce the obligation entered into by their citizens when naturalized under her own laws. This practice, even supposing the release of every person thus detained, obviously subjects our captured citizens, upon mere suspicion, to hardships and perils from which they ought to be exempt, according to the established rules in relation to prisoners of war.

The evidence under the third head shows that while all other American citizens were permitted to depart within a reasonable time after the declaration of war, all mariners who were in the dominions of Great Britain, whether they resorted to her ports in time of peace for lawful purposes or were forced into them under pretense of illegal commerce, are considered prisoners of war. The injustice of this exception is not more apparent than the jealousy it discloses toward that useful class of our fellow-citizens. But the committee can not but remark that if the practice of hiring American seamen to navigate British vessels is generally adopted and authorized, and that it is suffered appears from the advertisement of George Maude, the British agent at Port Royal, which is to be found with the testimony collected under the first head, that the naval strength of that Empire will be increased in proportion to the number of our seamen in bondage.

The present war having changed the relation of the two countries, the pretended right of impressment can no longer be exercised, but the same end may be accomplished by the substitution of this mode. Every seaman thus employed, the terms of whose engagement have not been ascertained, increases the naval strength of the enemy, not only by depriving the United States of his active services, but by enabling Great Britain to carry on and even extend her commerce without diminishing the number of sailors employed in her vessels of war.

The testimony collected under the fourth head proves that it is the ordinary practice of the officers of the British armed vessels to force impressed Americans to serve against their country by threats, by corporal punishment, and even by the fear of immediate execution, an instructing commentary upon the professions of the Government of its readiness to release impressed American seamen found on board ships of war.

On the evidence collected under the fifth head it is only necessary to observe that in one case, the case of Dr. McKeehan, the enormity is increased by the circumstance of the flag being divested of everything of a hostile character, having solely for its object the relief of the wounded and suffering prisoners who were taken at the River Raisin on the 22d of January, 1813. The treatment of Dr. McKeehan, not by the allies of Britain, but by officers of her army, can only be rationally accounted for by the supposition that it was considered good policy to deter American surgeons from going to the relief of their countrymen, as the Indian surgeons had a more speedy and effectual mode of relieving their sufferings.

The evidence respecting the ransom of American prisoners from Indians, collected under the sixth head, deserves attention, principally from the policy it indicates, and it is connected with Indian cruelties. Considering the savages as an auxiliary military force in the pay of Great Britain, the amount of ransom may be regarded as part of their stipulated compensation for military services;

and as ransoms would be increased and their value enhanced by the terror inspired by the most shocking barbarities, it may be safely concluded, whatever may be the intention of the British Government, that the practice of redeeming captives by pecuniary means will be occasionally quickened by the butchery of our fellow-citizens and by indignities offered to their remains, as long as the Indians are employed by the enemy. The justice of this conclusion is confirmed by the testimony of those witnesses who were retained after ransoming prisoners of war.

The testimony collected under the seventh head shows that the property of unarmed citizens has been pillaged by the officers and crews of the British vessels of war on our coast, their houses burnt, and places of public worship mutilated and defiled. It appears that officers, animated by the presence of Admiral Cockburn, particularly distinguished themselves in these exploits.

This evidence proves that they were governed by the combined motives of avarice and revenge. Not satisfied with bearing off for their own convenience the valuable articles found, the others which furnished no allurements to their cupidity were wantonly defaced and destroyed. It has been alleged in palliation of these acts of wanton cruelty that a flag sent on shore by the admiral was fired upon by the American militia. The evidence proves this not to have been the fact. This pretense has been resorted to only to excuse conduct which no circumstances can justify.

The committee forbear to make any observation upon the testimony collected under the eighth head from a perfect conviction that no person of this or any other nation can read the simple narrative of the different witnesses of the grossest violation of honor, justice, and humanity without the strongest emotions of indignation and horror. That these outrages were perpetrated by Indians is neither palliation nor excuse. Every civilized nation is answerable for the conduct of the allies under their command, and while they partake of the advantages of their success, they are equally partakers of the odium of their crimes.

The British forces concerned in the affair of the 22d, at the River Raisin, are more deeply implicated in the infamy of these transactions than by this mode of reasoning, however correct.

The massacre of the 23d of January, after the capitulation, was perpetrated without any exertion on their part to prevent it; indeed, it is apparent from all the circumstances that if the British officers did not connive at their destruction they were criminally indifferent about the fate of the wounded prisoners.

But what marks more strongly the degradation of the British soldiers is the refusal of the last offices of humanity to the bodies of the dead. The bodies of our countrymen were exposed to every indignity and became food for brutes in the sight of men who affect a sacred regard to the dictates of honors and religion. Low indeed is the character of that army which is reduced to the confession that their savage auxiliaries will not permit them to perform the rites of sepulture to the slain. The committee have not been able to discover even the expression of that detestation which such conduct must inspire from the military or civil authority on the Canadian frontier unless such detestation is to be presumed from the choice of an Indian trophy as an ornament for the legislative hall of upper Canada.

The committee have considered it their duty to submit the evidence collected under the ninth head of the atrocities committed at Hampton, although these enormities have been committed since their appointment. These barbarities may be rationally considered as the consequence of the example set by the officers of the naval force on our coast. Human turpitude is always progressive, and soldiers are prepared for the perpetration of the most dreadful crimes by the commission of minor offenses with impunity. That troops who had been instigated by the example of their officers to plunder the property and burn the houses of unarmed citizens should proceed to rape and murder need not excite surprise, however it may excite horror. For every detestable violation of humanity an excuse is fabricated or found.

The wounded prisoners on the northern frontier were massacred by the Indians, the sick murdered, and the women violated at Hampton by foreign troops in the pay of Great Britain. These pretenses, admitting them to be true, are as disgraceful as the conduct which made a resort to them necessary. Honor and magnanimity not only forbid the soldier to perpetrate crimes, but require exertion on his part to prevent them. If in defiance of discipline, acts of violence are committed upon any individual entitled to protection, the exemplary punishment of the offender can alone vindicate the reputation of the nation by whom he is employed. Whether such exertions were made by the British soldiers or the character of the British nation thus vindicated the evidence will show.

The shrieks of innocent victims of infernal lust at Hampton were heard by the American prisoners, but were too weak to reach the ears or disturb the repose of the British officers, whose duty, as men, required them to protect every female whom the fortune of war had thrown into their power. The committee will not dwell on this hateful subject. Human language affords no terms strong enough to express the emotions which the examination of the evidence has awakened. They rejoice that these acts have appeared so incredible to the American people. And for the honor of human nature they deeply regret that the evidence so clearly establishes their truth. In the correspondence between the commanders of the American and British forces will be found what is equivalent to an admission of the facts by the British commander.

The committee have yet to learn that the punishment of the officers has followed the conviction of their guilt. The power of retaliation being vested by law in the Executive Magistrate, no measure is considered necessary to be proposed but the resolution annexed to this report.

As such enormities, instead of inspiring terror, as was probably intended, are, in the opinion of the committee, calculated to produce a contrary effect, they submit for the consideration of the House the following resolution:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to have collected and presented to this House, during the continuance of the present war, evidence of every departure by the enemy from the ordinary modes of conducting war among civilized nations.

This report describes the methods pursued by British armies everywhere—in India, in America during the Revolutionary war, in Egypt, in South Africa. Murder, arson, robbery—these are everywhere the accompaniments of conquest.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that it is quite the fashion now-a-days to extol the wisdom of the rulers of Great Britain. I have heard it said that so wise are they that every country invaded and conquered by British armies and reduced to political vassalage and industrial slavery by British methods is distinctly benefited by the proceeding. Such laudations of the British partners of the Administration, heretofore heard only occasionally, has recently become a prelude to the profession of faith of the defenders of imperialism.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of the happiness of the conquered millions who have lived and died in misery and in poverty under the accursed flag of the conqueror, I would to God this tribute to the English were deserved. If I believed it, I would not question the

wisdom or the Americanism of the policy by which the Administration has given the world to understand that England is the model upon which henceforth as a nation we will build, nor gainsay the wisdom of attempting imitation of a nation capable of such a miracle.

With the exception of Canada and Australasia, which are colonies, peopled by Englishmen, invested with the right of home rule, and united to the British colonies by ties of blood and relationship, and which otherwise could not be held in subjection for a single day, not one of the British dependencies is a willing appanage of the Crown. The inhabitants of not one of the Crown colonies are contented, happy, or prosperous. In the Crown colonies of the British Empire the hideous cruelty of the conqueror in the past is handed down as a tradition from father to son to keep alive the hatred which never sleeps and the hope of deliverance which, ever receding, still shines in the far-away future.

In Ireland, in India, in South Africa, in Egypt thousands curse the flag which is the symbol of the enslavement of their country and long for the downfall and destruction of the despotic power whose soldiery have burned their cities, destroyed their farms, slaughtered their sons, and defiled their daughters and wives. The history of one of these conquered colonies is the history of all.

Ireland, fair, fertile, and peopled by a race whose sons have won laurels in the higher walks of life in all quarters of the world, who everywhere else except in their own country sit in the highest councils of government—Ireland, hopeless victim of centuries of martyrdom, bleeding from a thousand wounds, points to her rags, her poverty, the wretchedness of her people, and to those Americans who prate of the blessings brought to the victims of British conquest exclaims, "Behold one of the blessed!" India, South Africa, and Egypt, who will say that these stricken nations have profited by the imposition of an alien despotism, through whose ministrations they have become the foraging ground of English speculators and plunderers?

Mr. Chairman, I give notice that upon the first favorable opportunity I shall attempt to set out the truth as to the condition of the people of the Crown colonies of Great Britain. So long has the boast that English rule guarantees to conquered countries an admirable government and increased happiness gone unchallenged that a few credulous Americans seem disposed to accept it as the truth, and, if we are to accept current history as a correct interpreter of these views, the President and his advisers so ardently believe it that, in launching this Government upon the career of a "world power," they propose to copy the British system of colonial rule to the last syllable.

Observe how true it is that our Government is being Anglicized.

The British Crown colonies have no voice in the government under which they live. Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands are to be similarly treated. The inhabitant of the British Crown colony is not entitled to the constitutional safeguards enjoyed by the citizen of England. The inhabitants of Porto Rico and the Philippines are not to share with us the benefits of the Bill of Rights or the blessings and immunities guaranteed by the Constitution. The King of Great Britain, with the help of his ministers, rules as an emperor in the Crown colonies and as a constitutional monarch of limited power in the British Islands. Our Chief Executive, with the help of his ministers, is to exercise the powers of an emperor in the conquered islands and remain the President of a free people in the United States.

And, Mr. Chairman, not only are we to adopt the British colonial system bodily, in governing the vassal states brought under our dominion by force. In reducing the inhabitants to subjection we are resorting to precisely the measures employed by "the mother country" in similar cases. A few days ago, at Cape Town, an editor was arrested by a British officer, charged with publishing matter alleged to be seditious. He had criticised Lord Kitchener's order directing the British soldiers to burn farmhouses occupied by women and children. He had declared that Lord Roberts shut the door to the return of peace by demanding, as a condition precedent to any negotiations whatever with the Boer commanders, "unconditional surrender." For this the Cape Town editor was arrested and ordered to trial for publishing seditious.

We have had not one, but several similar cases in the Philippine Islands. The only difference between our mode of procedure and that at Cape Town is that the Cape Town editor was ordered to be tried. At Manila editors have been banished without trial. We are improving upon the methods of our teacher. The British award to editors who call in question the methods adopted or the conduct of the military officials at least the form of a trial. Probably they regard this course as essential to a show of decency. Not so with the commander of Mr. McKinley's army in the Philippines. When anything offensive to that high and mighty potentate appears in a Manila newspaper, the editor is seized and banished, and there the matter ends.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to read the general order under which General MacArthur proceeds against those who print in newspapers anything offensive to the commander of our forces. It is not

calculated to improve one's opinion of military government. Here it is:

The newspapers and other periodicals of Manila are especially admonished that any article published in the midst of such martial environment which by any construction can be classed as seditious must be regarded as intended to injure the army of occupation and as subjecting all connected with the publication to such punitive action as may be determined by the undersigned.

Mr. Chairman, if the newspapers have correctly reported the nature of the offense of one of the Manila editors who incurred the displeasure of General MacArthur and was banished from the island of Luzon, this extraordinary general order, drastic, brutal as it is, was certainly necessary to insure conviction; for even though accuser, judge, and executioner, centered in the same individual, tried the case before the accused was arrested, it is difficult to see how the conclusion was reached that the matter published was seditious. The editor had severely criticised one of the officers engaged in the revenue service in Manila Bay. Certainly, if this was the sum and total of his offense, it required a lively imagination and violent stretching of this drag-net general order to adjudge, "by any construction," that it was seditious.

But, Mr. Chairman, this all goes to make up the glory of the "world power." It is by just such means that "world powers" are built up. To build a "world power" we must tear down liberty. To force upon an unwilling people the thralldom of alien rule we must suppress the right of free speech, the freedom of the press, the right of assembly and of petition. We must overturn the foundation stones of republicanism and democracy and give full play to the meanest methods of despotism; and, sir, in doing thus we are only copying the policy of the most successful of colonizing powers, "the mother country."

Gentlemen may say that the course pursued by General MacArthur is absolutely necessary. Oh, I admit it. In order to conquer 12,000,000 people who regard the enslavement of their country as an appalling misfortune, our soldiers must burn, kill, and destroy. They must strike terror to the hearts of the people by the rigor of the laws imposed and the measures employed in their enforcement. It is in the performance of this task that the millions extracted from the pockets of the people by the imposition of the war taxes is being expended, and I present these unpalatable facts as the basis of the inquiry I propound. What else do the taxpayers get for this money except the privilege of knowing that their country has become a "world power" of the English variety, and is robbing a distant people of the right of independence and home rule, and compelling a liberty-loving people to foot the bills?

If this is all they are to receive does it pay to imitate so closely the example of "the mother country?" Does it pay to be a world power? Have recent similar ventures paid the mother country for the money invested in carrying on a war with such savage energy that when the hard-pressed foe asked for a parley, with a view of ascertaining the future purposes of the invader, the answer was, "Before fixing terms of peace or intimating its future purposes my Government demands an unconditional surrender?" Neither treasure or bloodshed would be spared in teaching the unfortunate victims of this brutal ultimatum the unfathomable infamy and gross cruelty of a "world power" in quest of booty.

Mr. Chairman, so it always has been—so it ever will be. Conquering armies, dealing with antagonists too weak to make adequate reprisals, acknowledge no allegiance to the law of nations, the usages of war, or the impulses of enlightened humanity. When Lord Roberts, after the capture of Pretoria, informed the Boers that a cessation of hostilities would not be discussed until those in arms made an "unconditional surrender," he was only following the precedents. Commanders of British armies have made this answer to prayers for peace a great many times. When the commander of our armies made this same answer to the Filipinos, who piteously begged for a cessation of hostilities precipitated by a collision between privates of the two armies on the picket line, he was faithfully following the example of the model "colonizing power," the mother country.

I send up to be read by the Clerk the comments of an Englishman of world-wide reputation upon the penalty paid by his country for pursuing this wicked policy in South Africa.

The Clerk read as follows:

LORD ROBERTS'S REPLY TO GENERAL BOTHA.

LONDON, February 11.

Sir Edward Clarke, the former solicitor-general, following up his speech of February 7 before the Holborn Conservative Association, has written a letter to a friend, citing Lord Roberts's rejection of the opportunity to propose peace terms in June, 1900, when General Buller had prepared the way by conferences with Christian Botha, who asked what was offered. Lord Roberts replied:

"Unconditional surrender," the privates to be allowed to go to their farms and no promises to the commanders or to any who had taken an active part in bringing on the war. "This," says Sir Edward Clarke, "put an end to all negotiations. So the war has gone on. The losses since have been 124 officers and 1,454 men killed in action and died of wounds; 63 officers and 3,620 men died of disease, and 890 officers and 22,637 men invalided home. We have spent some sixty to seventy millions devastating a country over which we desire to rule. We do not seem a day nearer 'unconditional surrender' than seven months ago."

Sir Edward Clarke says he earnestly hopes terms acceptable without dishonor will be offered to the Boers.

Mr. Chairman, it would have been better for England, and infinitely better for the Boers, if a policy more humane had dictated the answer to De Wet's offer to negotiate. It would have been better for the United States, and better for the Filipinos, if, when Aguinaldo begged for a cessation of hostilities, our commanding officer had been authorized to grant the request instead of saying, "The struggle having begun it must go on to the end," coupled with a demand for "unconditional surrender." The millions upon millions we are wasting, and the lives of our soldiers and their victims could have been saved. But it could not be; we were embarking in business as a "world power." To establish a reputation in the new rôle we must ignore the prayers of the weak, and upon the slightest resistance of our unjust assumption of authority fall upon the malcontents with fire and sword.

All that has followed was inevitable. I forbear specifications, but, Mr. Chairman, we all know that during our occupation of the Philippine Islands heartbreaking horrors—things we would like to forget—have attended the operations of our armies. If not quite as bad, certainly the means we have employed against the people of the islands have been little better than those employed by the British in South Africa. I say it was unescapable. Wars of conquest, to be successful, must be carried on with ruthless disregard of the promptings of humanity. A people fighting for their country's independence are not easily dismayed.

The love of liberty divests the prison and the scaffold of their terrors. We in the Philippines, and the mother country in South Africa, are finding out that if our victims can not match us in numbers, in armament, in resources, they are sustained in the unequal struggle by love of country and fireside and prefer death to slavery. To go on killing and killing and killing is expensive. This session's appropriation bills attest how expensive it is, but in no other way can we succeed. The spirit of resistance can be broken in no other way. The fire kindled in heart and brain by love of fatherland must be quenched in the blood of patriots.

Mr. Chairman, Does it pay? Where is it to end? Has the limit been reached? Are we any nearer peace than we were two years ago? How long must we maintain in the Philippines an army of 65,000 men? Are we to hold these islands perpetually by force of arms? Do you tell me that peace has been practically restored—that the insurrection, as you call it, has subsided? Why, that can not be, or certainly editors would not be banished for printing criticisms of public officials. Certainly, unless the situation is very critical indeed, our commanding general would not dare to do such a thing without giving the accused a trial. Let gentlemen who feel called upon to defend the policy of the Administration choose either horn of the dilemma, and they will find it difficult to convince the taxpayers that the Philippine game is worth the powder we are using.

Is the suppression of free speech and freedom of the press—the banishment of editors who print their views concerning public measures and public officials—made necessary by the military situation in the Philippines? If so, then the war is not over. Has our commanding general been guilty of this act of tyranny without the necessity? If so, then the horrors of imperial rule are worse than we have painted them. If the Republican statesmen who defend imperialism and take the responsibility of taxing the people for its support admit that our troops, after two years' fighting, have not so far succeeded in subduing resistance to our authority as to render unnecessary a war measure so drastic and extraordinary as the banishment, without trial, of an editor charged with publishing sedition, they can not escape the admission that little headway has been made; and no man can tell how long we must go on increasing military expenditures.

If the edict of banishment was wantonly pronounced—was a mere exhibition of the brutality of power—then the officer guilty of it should be tried by a court-martial and discharged from the service in disgrace. Take your choice, gentlemen. Are conditions such that we can not maintain our foothold in the Philippines without resorting to proceedings like this? If they are not, why were these proceedings had?

Mr. Chairman, the truth is that little by little we are learning precisely the situation in the Philippine Islands. We are at war with a race differing from us in ideals, in religion, in civilization. Our avowed object is the conquest of their country. Whether justifiably or not, they believe that we have grossly abused their confidence. Thus believing, they abhor the idea of submitting their destinies to our keeping. When our soldiers succeed in cornering a band of Filipinos, they are butchered. So it was when Spain ruled the country. Revolt after revolt occurred, but the natives, poorly armed, poorly equipped, unaccustomed to the use of modern arms and poorly supplied with them, were killed by thousands and finally vanquished. Over and over again this bloody spectacle disgraced Spanish dominion of the islands, and if our armies and an American carpetbag government is to be maintained there, Americans may expect it to occur over and over again in the future.

The war has been in progress for two years, and no living man

can tell when it will end, and when it is over we will be compelled to keep the army there, not for a year or two or for a generation, but as long as we hold dominion over our vassal possessions. Thus we may hold away, not of the entire archipelago, but of such portions of it as are occupied by our soldiers. Remove the soldiers and the people will resume control over their domestic affairs, which, as far as municipal control is concerned, was not disturbed during the lengthy period of Spanish occupation. We will be obeyed by a portion of the inhabitants, responsive to force, disobeyed by those not under actual surveillance, and cordially hated by all.

This is what the taxpayers, who are footing the bill, get for their money, and it is all they ever will receive. In time of peace the victims of our cruelty will be a burden, and in time of war, should opportunity offer, they will flock to the standard of our enemies.

Mr. Chairman, viewed from any standpoint, the foreign policy of the Administration, especially in its treatment of questions relating to the Orient, has been wrong, irretrievably, fatally wrong. Our aim should be to extend the commerce and not the sovereignty of the United States into oriental countries. We should exemplify to the yellow races the excellence of Christian civilization by the observance of the loftiest standard of public morality. Instead of making of religion a cloak under which to conceal the dagger, we should maintain here in the New World a republican system of government, exempt from the vices of the monarchy, and guaranteeing to every creature within the national boundaries and our posterity forever the blessings of constitutional liberty.

Thus, and in no other way, may we hope to retain the veneration and love of just men and the lovers of liberty throughout the world. Thus, and in no other way, may we continue in the path marked out by the fathers of the Republic, a free people, preaching the propaganda of universal Democracy, a colossal figure towering high above those rapacious monsters of the family of nations who fatten upon the substance of murdered peoples, as beasts of prey upon their weaker fellows. Thus may Columbia continue the mission so full of honor—censor of injustice and despotism everywhere—the protector of popular liberty and constitutional government in these United States—the proud bearer of the sacred torch of Liberty Enlightening the World. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

General Deficiency Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. MADDUX,

OF GEORGIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 20, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 14236) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

Mr. MADDUX said:

Mr. SPEAKER: In considering the question of appropriations the idea is too prevalent on this floor that the resources of this Government are inexhaustible, that the money comes out of the Government and so there need be no great concern as to its disposition. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the money comes out of the Government, but if there need be no concern as to how it goes out, there is great need for concern as to how the money comes into the possession of the Government. There is too little consideration given to the burden that is imposed upon the taxpayer or to its necessity or justice.

The question of taxation is one of the most important which the conscientious legislator has to consider, both as regards the amount of the tax and the methods by which it is imposed. No more serious or difficult problem has ever been presented to the sociologist or the statesman than that of taxation; and it seems to have been the misfortune of our country to have fallen under the most unjust, unwise, and unequal method which could have been devised. Indirect taxation as enforced now by Republican methods is the device of the autocrat, the aristocrat, the political schemer, and the public plunderer. It has become the vehicle of the mercenary trickster to escape a fair share of the public expense and shift the burden to the shoulders of his poorer, more industrious, but more honest and honorable fellow-citizen.

Why is it that this Government can not be frank and honorable, open and just, with its fellow-citizens, and devise a method of taxation so that each individual may bear only his fair share of the public burden and pay only for such protection and benefit as he receives? This is the only just and equitable method of distributing the burden of governmental expense. It is the duty of the legislative branch of the Government to see to it that the Government is conducted at the lowest cost possible consistent

with its dignity and standing among nations and with a care for the best interests of all classes of society.

It is also its duty to see to it that the burden of this expense falls equally upon all classes and that the law is so constructed that no class or citizen can by any possible means shift his share of the burden to the shoulders of his less fortunate neighbors or profit financially by taking advantage of any weakness or fault in the law. Our Government is maintained exclusively by indirect taxation, which is nothing more nor less as it is now used than a cover for public plunderers. The effect is so little understood by the masses that, in his ignorance of the truth, the wronged citizen submits to impositions which would cause a revolution if fully comprehended. But this system is sowing the seed that will fruit in a whirlwind of popular indignation when its infamies are fully understood. It will breed an indignation against the class which conceived and profits by it that will burst into a storm which will overwhelm them.

How do we collect this tax which we so liberally scatter in various appropriations? By compelling every consumer to pay double the value for all he consumes, a part of which cost of maintenance finds its way into the public Treasury and the balance into the pockets of the social buccaneers in whose interest the laws were enacted. The cost of food, clothing, and shelter varies little between the millionaire and the laborer, but the burdens it represents to each differ immensely.

The cost of the necessities of life to a millionaire is insignificant, not even noticeable, when compared to his income, but to the laborer, the mechanic, the farmer, the widow, to the poor man who is able to earn but a frugal support, it is crushing. One thousand dollars per year for maintenance would be a bagatelle to the one, but a hopeless undertaking for the other; and yet we take advantage of the necessities of the helpless one to compel him to give his last penny, while we allow the other to escape without realizing that he has been put to any cost. Is this just, is it honest? In order to get at a proper understanding of the difference between direct and indirect taxation let us make some comparisons. In my own State the average rate of taxation for county purposes is about 56 cents per \$100, and this is found sufficient for meeting all reasonable expenses.

This tax is levied upon the assessed valuation of property. As the assessed value does not exceed two-thirds the actual value, the actual rate is less than one-half of 1 per cent—thirty-seven and five-tenths hundredths of 1 per cent. Let us suppose a farmer has a horse assessed at \$100; the tax on this horse would be 56 cents, and this would go to build and repair roads and bridges, pay county officials, supply school facilities, keep in repair public buildings, etc. A perceptible benefit is received from this tax, and it is proportioned with the possessions and ability of the individual to pay. Let us suppose, on the other hand, this same citizen has, during the same year, found it necessary to buy \$100 worth of woolen clothing and carpets for his family. Of this \$100 value, \$75 is tax imposed for tariff, if the goods are imported, or profit to the manufacturer if they are domestic; and in return for this what does the citizen receive?

This \$100 worth of woolen clothing and carpets, without the tariff, could be bought for \$25, even say \$50, but the tariff compels the foreign manufacturer to add the extra amount. Now, if the domestic manufacturer adds to his price a little less than the tariff, he undersells the foreigner and secures the addition in profit, and the Government gets nothing. So that the extra \$50 or \$75 goes into the pocket of the domestic manufacturer, the Government is defrauded, and the consumer robbed.

If he pays \$100 for a wagon, \$20 of the sum is taxes, while his direct tax on the same wagon is only 56 cents. If he requires nails for repairing his house, building his fences, or shoeing his horses, one-half the amount he pays is taxes. If he buys necessary clothing for his family, one-half of the amount he pays is taxes. If the millionaire buys diamonds or pearls for his wife or daughter, only one-tenth of the amount is taxes. If the farmer buys coarse woolen clothing, one-half of its cost is taxes; but when the millionaire buys silk only one-fourth is taxes.

The summing up of the whole story is that an average of at least one-half of what the citizen spends for maintenance is the demand for taxes, and as the average farmer, laborer, or mechanic is able to earn only sufficient for his support, it is safe to say that more than one-half of his entire earnings are consumed in taxes. Average the earnings at \$300 per annum, and the indirect tax consumes \$150, while the direct tax consumes only \$1.68.

That a large portion of the tariff tax does not go into the National Treasury, but into the pockets of the protected operators, is evidenced by the advance in their prices at a ratio parallel to the rate of duty imposed on each article. For instance, the price of nails was advanced within twelve months after the tariff law went into operation 115 per cent. The tax is about 100 per cent. Wrought iron advanced 100 per cent; wire goods, 100 per cent; tin doubled within a year; tin plate advanced 75 per cent; cheap grades of wall paper, 80 per cent; steel for horseshoes, 100 per cent; shoes 20

per cent to 50 per cent; lumber, 25 per cent; barbed wire, 87.5 per cent; bar iron, 80 per cent; window glass, 50 per cent; wire nails, 92 per cent; stoves, 33½ per cent; cotton cloth, 25 per cent; flannel, 50 per cent, etc.

That all commodities protected by the tariff or controlled by trusts have advanced from 25 per cent to 100 per cent can be demonstrated by incontrovertible evidence; and it can also be shown that from 20 per cent to 35 per cent of the stock of these combinations goes into the hands of promoters, who are mere parasites upon the body politic. The aggregate capital stock of trusts organized up to May 27, 1899, is reported by the Commercial Year Book and shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 8, 1900, to be \$6,572,064,181. Thirty per cent of this would be \$1,971,619,254.30, which is paid as a tribute to an idle and nonproducing class scheming to live on the labor and industry of the producing masses.

Estimate the return of this entire volume of trust stock at the low rate of 10 per cent and we have \$197,161,925.43 of tribute wrung from the people and flowing into the hands of the useless, idle, and totally vicious class of social parasites who add absolutely nothing to the wealth of the nation and less in the way of public benefit. This sum alone represents a per capita of \$2.80 for the entire nation, or \$14 for every head of a family, taken annually for tribute to schemers whose only business is to organize and manipulate devices to rob the industry of the nation; or a tax three times as great as that for county purposes in my State, if we estimate every man, woman, and child in the county as assessed for \$1,000 worth of property.

Now, further. If the aggregate capitalization is as shown by the Yearbook up to 1899, it is evident that the aggregate has been immensely increased during the past year, as the number of new combinations started has been phenomenal; but leaving out these additions and accepting the aggregate for 1899 and estimating the general average of profit as low as 30 per cent, we have \$1,971,619,254.34. For convenience let us say \$2,000,000,000, which sum is far below the probable amount. This sum represents a per capita tax of about \$27, or \$135 to the head of each family; which is about five times the amount of the direct county tax, assessing each man, woman, and baby at \$1,000, or every family in the county at \$5,000 assessed value, or as being actually worth \$7,500. Could anything be more infamous or unjust?

Taking the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1899, we find the gross receipts of the Treasury shown to have been \$1,038,451,340.18, or about one-half the profit of the stock of the trusts for that year, an evidence that at least one-half of the indirect taxation goes to the trusts in profit. But in our estimate it must be remembered that only the great aggregates of capital are represented, and consequently only part of the profits demonstrated.

Now let us see how a direct tax upon the accumulated wealth of the nation would meet the demands of the Government as well as this unjust and deceptive indirect system. The aggregate wealth of the nation increased in the decade 1880-1890 in a ratio of about 50 per cent for the ten years. Applying the same ratio of increase for the decade 1890-1900, we have an aggregate of wealth for the nation of \$97,555,636,797.

Estimating a levy of 1 per cent on this amount would give a revenue of \$975,556,367, or more than the actual gross receipts for the year 1898, which was a normal year and not affected by the Spanish-war appropriation, on which year the Secretary of the Treasury reports \$738,549,255.20 as the gross receipts—a difference of \$237,005,111.80 in favor of the 1 per cent levy. This is evidence of the fact that an extremely small percentage levied on actual holdings would meet the obligations and necessities of the Government and at the same time place the burden equitably and justly.

The gross receipts for the year 1900, increased as it was by the expense of the Spanish war, was, as shown by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$886,443,117.77, or \$89,113,249.23 less than would be realized by a levy of 1 per cent. Indeed, it is reasonable to assert that under normal conditions a levy of one-half of 1 per cent upon the aggregate of wealth would be sufficient to meet the requirements of the Government; the outrageous oppression and injustice now existing would be relieved, and the infamous robbery of the poor would cease.

Now, this iniquitous indirect taxation, as levied by the Republican party, reduced to cold and naked fact, is nothing more nor less than a method of giving to a favored class the privilege of levying tribute or taxes upon the industrial masses to an extent which, if levied by Congress in the shape of a direct tax, would start the blaze of revolution throughout the land, for the unearned profits which I have shown have been added to the cost of manufactured articles are nothing more nor less than a tax levied upon industry by centralized wealth. The addition of 1 cent a yard to the cost of woolen or cotton goods for clothing, of 10 cents to the cost of a pair of shoes, or 1 cent to the cost of the transportation of a bushel of wheat, all represent a heavy tax levied on the people.

For instance, the addition of 1 cent a bushel to the cost of transportation of the wheat crop of 1899 (which would be added

to the cost of flour) would represent a tax aggregating \$5,473,038; of 1 cent a yard to woolen goods would represent a tax of \$3,529,748; 1 cent a yard on cotton goods would represent a tax of about \$2,235,815. These figures are from the census of 1890. Here is a tax of \$11,238,601 which would be levied upon the industries of the country by an addition to the cost of these articles almost imperceptible to the consumer. Now conceive, if you can, the enormous sum annually plundered from the people when the fabulous advances in the cost of every article of utility is added at the rate I have already shown.

Nor is this question of the amount of the burden the only or most serious one involved in this colossal problem; indeed, it is the one of the very least importance when we realize that the very foundations of our free institutions are being undermined, the equality of which we boast being destroyed, the liberties of the people being taken from them, the spirit of independence crushed, every characteristic which has contributed to the elevation and progression of our people eliminated, and that they are being reduced to the conditions of a servile race, dependent upon the will and favor of a fortunate class.

By this system the great middle class is being destroyed, and soon there will exist but two classes—the extremely rich and the very poor—a dominant and a servile class. The palace will overshadow the hovel. The spirit of independence, the courage of equality destroyed, the American character is emasculated and American citizenship degraded, our people reduced to the plane of the European peasantry. Nor while undergoing this change in the school of adversity and injustice at the hands of the very power which is of their own creation do they submit to the decrees of necessity humbly and complacently. There is engendered in every breast and hidden in the deepest recesses of every heart a spirit of resentment, which will, when there seems no hope of relief and the oppression has grown unbearable, burst into a flame of rage that will sweep the land as a besom of destruction; that will tear up by the root these evil systems that have been planted and so carefully nurtured by the mercenary and selfish spirit which controls and inspires the avaricious class which conceived them. These infamous systems have not only opened a breach between our people, destroyed their solidarity, and inspired class antagonism and animosities, but are constantly widening the gulf, until, eventually, there must logically result either imperialism or revolution, and the history of France and the horrors of her revolution may be repeated in our own country.

Much might be said of the enormous unnecessary burden of our military arm and the danger to be apprehended from following the course of conquest and plunder upon which we have already entered, but time will not permit. Suffice it to say that this course is the logical accompaniment of these monarchical systems, and a strong military power the natural and only reliance of that element which prospers by these systems.

Dissimulation, rascality, and fraud are depended on until the outraged people will bear no more; then the bayonet, the cannon, and the saber are called to their brutal work of murdering liberty and riveting the shackles of slavery; of upholding and supporting the imperial throne erected by the mercenary greed, the brutal selfishness of the class who feed upon the substance of the helpless.

Here I take the liberty of reproducing from the speech of the Hon. GEORGE B. MCCLELLAN, of New York, a most careful and accurate legislator, an extract and a table of comparisons compiled by him of the costs of the military arm of the United States as compared with other countries, to which I invite special attention. Mr. MCCLELLAN said:

The combined appropriations for the Army and Navy represent the total war budget, or, as some European countries prefer to call it, the "defense budget." The total war budget of the United States, excluding appropriations due to past wars, amounts to \$23,102,435, or a cost per capita of population of \$3.63. Our total war budget, including appropriations due to past wars, amounts to \$36,818,527, a cost per capita of population of \$5.00. The total war budget of Austria-Hungary is \$74,592,613, a cost per capita of population of \$1.66.

The total war budget of France is \$190,197,542, a cost per capita of population of \$4.92. The total war budget of the German Empire is \$188,547,345, a cost per capita of population of \$3.60. The total war budget of Italy is \$62,375,243, a cost per capita of population of \$1.97. The total war budget of Russia is \$148,000,017, a cost per capita of population of \$1.14. The combined total war budgets of France and of the German Empire amount to \$378,744,887, or \$8,073,640 less than that of the United States.

The criticism has been made that there can be no comparison between the cost of maintaining our Army and the cost of maintaining those of Europe, for the reason that the European private receives "no pay" and ours receives \$156 a year. As a matter of fact, while service is compulsory on the Continent, the continental private is paid a small sum, amounting on the average to about \$56 a year. In other words, our private receives about \$100 more than his comrade of Europe. This criticism does not affect comparisons, as will be seen on the consideration of a few figures.

The war budget of the German Empire is the largest in Europe. Were the Prussian private to receive the same pay as our private the Prussian army budget would be swelled to \$212,354,345. Were the Russian private to receive the same pay as our private the Russian budget would be swelled to about \$190,000,000 per annum. The difference in pay does not account for the proportionate difference in the size of the budgets, for were our Army to be increased to the size of that of the German Empire our budget would be increased by \$702,644,320, making a total of \$854,712,420, without including expenses due to past wars, or, including such expenses, making an Army budget of \$1,009,406,712.

Were our Army to be increased to the size of Russia's, our budget would

be increased by \$1,132,130,230, making a total Army budget, without including appropriations due to past wars, of \$1,284,188,320, or, including appropriations due to past wars, making a total budget of \$1,438,882,612.

I submit these figures to the consideration of the House without any comment whatsoever. Comment is unnecessary.

TABLE A.—Analysis of the war budget of the United States as agreed to, or about to be agreed to, by the House of Representatives, first session Fifty-sixth Congress.

1. ARMY.

Appropriations for the active Army.

Army bill.....	\$117,894,649.10
Military Academy bill.....	700,151.88
Fortification bill.....	7,227,461.00
Legislative, executive, and judicial bill:	
Office of the Secretary of War.....	\$104,150
Office of the Auditor for the War Department.....	318,300
Offices of heads of so-called "staff" departments.....	653,826
Maintenance of three-eighths of Department building.....	\$45,990
Rent.....	13,500
Stationery.....	32,500
Postage.....	1,000
Contingent expenses.....	58,000

Sundry civil bill:	
Arsenals and armories.....	281,550
Military posts.....	1,008,960
Bringing home dead.....	150,000
Maps, etc.....	5,100
Printing and binding.....	244,000
Repairs, three-eighths Department building.....	31,500

Deficiencies submitted:	
December 11, 1900.....	12,062,223.36
January 21, 1901.....	5,835,239.50
January 20, 1901.....	5,300,000.00

Total, active Army.....\$152,068,100.84

Appropriations growing out of past wars.

Pensions.....	145,245,230.00
Salaries, Pension Bureau, etc.....	3,352,700.00
Record and Pension Office.....	585,170.00
National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.....	3,074,142.00
State Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.....	950,000.00
Back pay and bounty (civil war).....	325,000.00

TABLE A.—Continued.

Appropriations growing out of past wars—Continued.

Arrears of pay (Spanish war).....	\$200,000.00
National cemeteries.....	191,880.00
Artificial limbs and appliances.....	27,000.00
Headstones and burials.....	28,000.00
Apache prisoners.....	2,500.00
Secretary of War, extra clerks (Spanish war).....	600,000.00
Auditor for War Department, extra clerks (Spanish war).....	112,580.00

Total.....154,694,292.00
Appropriations for the active Army.....152,068,100.84

Total Army budget.....306,762,392.84

2. NAVY.

Naval bill.....77,016,635.00

Legislative, executive, and judicial bill:	
Office of the Secretary of the Navy.....	\$47,900.00
Office of the Auditor for the Navy Department.....	68,080.00
Offices of heads of bureaus, etc.....	224,430.00
Maintenance of three-eighths of Department building.....	45,990.00
Contingent expenses.....	12,750.00

Sundry civil bill:	
Printing and binding.....	127,000.00
Deficiencies submitted:	
December 11, 1900.....	74,481.09
December 17, 1900.....	20,000.00
January 21, 1901.....	2,287,088.55
January 25, 1901.....	130,000.00

Total, active Navy.....80,031,335.24
Auditor for Navy Department, extra clerks (Spanish war).....21,800.00

Total Navy budget.....80,056,135.24

3. RECAPITULATION.

Active Army.....	\$152,068,100.84
Active Navy.....	80,031,335.24

Army (past wars).....154,694,292.00
Navy (past wars).....21,800.00

Total war budget.....\$386,818,528.08

TABLE B.—Analysis of war budgets of various armies.

	Population by last census.	Latest obtainable army budget.	Total enlisted strength, peace footing.	Cost of maintaining one enlisted man for one year.	Cost of army per capita of population.	Latest obtainable naval budget.	Cost of navy per capita of population.	Total war budget.	Cost of army and navy combined per capita of population.
Austria-Hungary.....	44,901,036	\$67,564,446	368,002	\$183.80	\$1.50	\$7,023,167	\$0.15	\$74,592,613	\$1.66
France.....	38,517,975	128,959,064	589,541	218.74	3.34	61,238,478	1.58	190,197,542	4.92
German Empire.....	52,246,589	150,127,743	562,295	277.85	1.98	32,419,602	.62	188,547,345	3.60
Italy.....	31,479,217	43,920,132	216,720	202.65	1.30	18,455,111	.58	62,375,243	1.97
Russia.....	129,211,113	99,927,797	835,143	119.65	.77	48,132,220	.37	148,060,017	1.14
United States, not including cost of past wars.....	76,295,220	152,068,100	100,000	1,530.00	1.99	80,034,335	1.04	233,102,435	3.03
United States, including cost of past wars.....	76,295,220	306,762,392	100,000	3,067.00	4.02	80,056,135	1.04	386,818,527	5.06

At this point I beg to submit some official statistics showing the amount of revenue collected from the people in the decade beginning with 1890 and ending with 1900; also, the decade beginning with 1850 and ending with 1859, showing the amount of revenue collected for each year, the population and the per capita taxes, and the amount of burden on each head of a family or producer. These figures speak for themselves and need no comment.

Annual revenue and per capita burden, 1890-1900.

Year.	Customs revenue.	Internal revenue.	Total.	Per capita.	Annual burden of tax to each head of family or producer.
1890.....	\$229,668,564.57	\$162,006,705.81	\$392,275,290.56	\$5.33	\$29.65
1891.....	219,522,205.23	145,686,249.44	365,208,454.67	5.91	29.55
1892.....	177,452,964.15	153,971,072.57	331,424,036.72	5.14	25.70
1893.....	203,355,016.73	161,027,623.93	364,382,640.66	5.65	28.25
1894.....	131,818,530.62	147,111,232.81	278,929,763.43	4.30	21.50
1895.....	152,158,617.45	143,421,672.02	295,580,289.47	4.47	22.35
1896.....	160,021,751.67	146,762,894.74	306,784,646.41	4.58	22.90
1897.....	176,554,126.65	146,688,574.29	323,242,700.94	4.79	23.95
1898.....	149,575,062.35	170,900,641.49	320,475,703.84	4.73	23.65
1899.....	206,128,481.75	273,437,161.51	479,565,643.26	6.85	34.25
1900.....	233,164,871.10	295,327,926.76	528,492,797.82	7.33	36.75
Average annual.....				5.42+	27.22

Annual revenue and per capita burden, decade 1850-1859.

Year.	Net revenue.	Population.	Per capita.	Burden to head of family.
1850.....	\$43,003,439	23,191,876	\$1.88	\$9.40
1851.....	52,550,304	23,965,000	2.19	10.95
1852.....	49,846,816	24,802,000	2.01	10.05
1853.....	61,587,054	25,615,000	2.40	12.00
1854.....	73,800,341	26,423,000	2.79	13.95
1855.....	65,350,575	27,296,000	2.40	12.00
1856.....	74,056,699	28,083,000	2.64	13.20
1857.....	68,965,313	28,916,000	2.38	11.90
1858.....	46,655,366	29,753,000	1.57	7.85
1859.....	53,486,466	30,596,000	1.75	8.75
General average.....			2.20	11.00
1861.....	41,509,930	32,064,000	1.29	*6.45

*Annual per capita per producer when the Republican party came into power.

As an illustration of the unequal distribution of the moneys taxed from the people, the following extract from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury is most striking.

According to his statement, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, there was expended for the maintenance of the military establishment, including pensions, the enormous sum of \$331,612,978.12. Against this there is shown to have been expended for the civil department, including the expenses of Congress, the Executive Departments, judiciary, governments in the Territories, sub-treasuries, public-land offices, mints, and assay offices, the comparatively insignificant sum of \$24,435,363.93. Of this amount

only \$2,636,074.12 went to the Agricultural Department for the encouragement and development of the most important industry known to man, and upon which all must depend even for life itself.

The estimate for the military establishment for 1903 is about \$100,000,000—largely more than the amount expended by any of the great monarchical powers of Europe upon its military arm; and this in a so-called popular government in a time of profound peace. What does it mean?

The estimates for appropriations by the Fifty-sixth Congress reached the appalling figure of \$1,500,000,000, or a per capita of \$80; equal to a tax of \$100 upon the head of each family.

The appropriations for agriculture by this Congress are no more than the amount set apart for the military and naval schools at West Point and Annapolis; less than one-third as much as that for fortifications. The plea is made by the defenders of the protective-tariff system that it was established for the protection of American labor. If this claim be true, the evidence would be shown in the improved condition in the manufacturing sections especially.

Let us look at the conditions in New England, as shown by the Eleventh Census. In 1880, in Connecticut, only 10.22 per cent of its farms were occupied by tenants; in 1890, 43.28 per cent of the farmers were tenants, a loss of 33.06 per cent of free owners in ten years. Of her population who live in towns, 86.06 per cent were tenants; or an average of 64.67 of her population, rural and urban, are tenants. In Massachusetts, in 1880, only 8.18 per cent of the farmers were tenants; in 1890, 43.93 per cent were tenants. In the towns, 80.15 per cent of the population were tenants. Averaging town homes and farms together, 77.32 per cent were tenants; showing a diminution of 62.26 per cent in ten years.

In the city of Boston 83.57 per cent of the population were tenants, and reckoning mortgagors as virtual tenants, 89 per cent. In Rhode Island, in 1880, 19.88 per cent of the farmers were renters; in 1890, 39.29 per cent were tenants; a diminution in free owners of 19.41 per cent in ten years. Of the urban population in 1890, 87.14 per cent were tenants. In Vermont, in 1880, 13.41 per cent of the farms were occupied by tenants; in 1890, 54.15 per cent, a diminution of 40.74 per cent in free home owners. In New Hampshire, in 1880, 8.13 per cent of the farmers were tenants; in 1890, 30.23 per cent. Of the town population, 70.67 per cent were tenants in 1890.

There is no better evidence of prosperity than a large percentage of free home owners; and yet, in the very home of the tariff supporters, we see this startling diminution in the number of free home owners, whole communities losing their homes, falling into a condition of dependence; and yet, shelterless, homeless, dependent upon others for permission to labor for a livelihood, they shout for protective (?) tariff and mouth about "prosperity!" Prosperity for whom?

This group of States has had the very best opportunity to prosper by existing conditions. They have had the greatest diversity of industry, and those which are especially fostered by the protective tariff; and yet we see a steady and startling diminution in the proportion of free-home earners, until within ten years 70 per cent are homeless, paying tribute to a small fraction of their number for their necessary shelter, and dependent on them for the employment by which they may gain their food.

The same condition is shown throughout the entire nation. On June 1, 1890, the general average of tenants in the aggregate of population, reckoning mortgage homes held on suffrage, was 74 per cent. There are no figures since those given in the Eleventh Census on this subject, but there is no questioning the fact that we are being surely and steadily reduced from a nation of free-home earners to a nation of tenants and vassals to a favored few. The percentage of tenant population in the United States is greater to-day than that of any other nation of the civilized world except Great Britain, and yet we boast of our independence.

The percentage of tenant population is shown by reliable statistical authority to be as follows:

	Per cent.		Per cent.
Australia	10.17	Portugal	28.17
Belgium	31.02	Germany	34.31
Denmark	66.09	Canada	12.01
France	28.94	Italy	55.19
Holland	39.60	Norway	31.82
Sweden	17.32	United States	74.00

In Great Britain practically the entire domain is held by the great proprietors, and practically the entire population are tenants. Our land and commercial systems and financial methods, being practically identical with those of England, aided by the unjust and unequal mode of taxation, the logical conclusion is that eventually we must reach the same status in which we find the British people.

The aggregate wealth of a nation is not evidence of its great prosperity; it is the equality of its distribution which insures the prosperity and happiness of the people. Centralized wealth is the accompaniment of poverty, misery, and tyranny, ignorance, brutality, and oppression. The more general the distribution of ac-

cumulated wealth, the freer, happier, and more enlightened the people; the more humanizing the influences which give character and tone to their lives; the more elevating and refining are the conditions by which they are surrounded.

The progression of human society is a question of distribution as well as of production. The Republican protective-tariff advocate sees only one side of the great problem, and his view of that is extremely distorted and confused.

Since the induction of the Republican party into power its ablest legislators have considered only the question of production. Indeed, this has been the sociological problem of the century, and the ingenuity of the entire civilized world has been directed toward this one subject, the development of the productive ability to the very greatest extent possible. The strides which have been made during the nineteenth century in this direction are without parallel in the world's history, and the story reads like the conception of a disordered brain or a page from a work of fiction.

The power of production has been developed to a point where a possibility of want from the lack of this power to produce does not exist; and yet want, destitution, suffering, starvation do exist even with this glut of plenty, this godlike power to create—and why? Because the problem of distribution has been overlooked; because in the endeavor to produce more and more, and ever more, the needs and rights of the patient laborer who makes this enormous production possible are ignored, overlooked, trampled upon by the overgrown avarice which is bred of this frenzy to produce.

Legislation has been entirely directed in the interest of production. The "infant industries" have been "protected" at the expense of the human infants who must sustain them. The machine, which was conceived as the servant of man, has become an ogre which devours him, a master which has enslaved him—and why? Because legislation has been so directed that the man has been compelled to supply the means of compassing his own enslavement by indirect taxation. The industrial masses have been compelled to bear an unequal share of the burden of progression, and through the necessities thrust upon them by this system of taxation their rightful share in the profits of production is taken from them and turned over to those in no way entitled to it.

Indirect taxation as now applied is absolutely unjust, unwise, and oppressive, because it invariably fails to accomplish the purpose for which taxes should be levied, and the burden falls upon the class least able to bear it and which in no way profits by any advantage it may confer. This is true for the reason that indirect taxes are always shifted until they rest finally upon the consumer, whose necessities compel him to meet any demand which may be made upon him, regardless of its injustice or the hardships which they entail.

A protective tariff results merely in the protection of the manufacturer, adding the amount of the tariff to the price of his product, which the consumer must pay. This can be done because the manufacturer is protected from competition, and so becomes a monopolist in his field; but in the employment of his labor he takes full advantage of the brutal competition in the labor field, and pays only what is absolutely necessary to sustain life in the human machine, the absence of competition in his field of production making the competition in the labor field severe to the point of brutality, and this brings us to the consideration of the latest evolution of indirect taxation and the tariff—the trust.

THE TRUST

is the natural evolution of this system. Indeed, it has been wisely said that "the tariff is the father of the trust;" and no more dangerous enemy to individual liberty could be conceived than the modern trust. It is in direct antagonism to the spirit of our institutions, the arch enemy of liberty, of popular government. It is a step in the direction of a return to autocracy, the quintessence of absolutism and slavery.

The trust is one of the most powerful influences which could be brought to bear for accomplishing the centralization of power which will overthrow our free institutions and install in their stead the iron hand of imperialism. The workings of this system are so insidious, so secret, its advances so gradual and stealthy, that the average citizen is enmeshed within its toils before he has time to realize the situation unless he is warned and put upon his guard. The trust system has developed gradually and imperceptibly, because, as has been said, it is the natural outgrowth of existing systems; it is the logical result of the protective tariff idea.

The evolution of the ages has brought about conditions never dreamed of, even by the seer in the past. Human society is a complicated mechanism, and human nature varies under varying conditions. Necessity is a stern master, and the character of the human animal is vitally influenced by it. Our social evolution has placed the individual between two powers—the one, the political government under which he lives, and which is of his own choosing, the burden of which is not heavy; the other, the power which controls the field of industry by which he exists, and which

is not of his own choosing, yet its mandates to him mean comfort or misery, life or death.

In this sense he is a slave. The master, through his rate of wages, dictates the kind of clothes he may wear, the food he may eat, the kind of shelter he may have, the advantages his children may enjoy. Sumptuary laws would be light oppression compared with such a condition. He is absolutely the creature of a master who controls the conditions which environ him. He is dependent upon this power for his very existence and the sustenance of those dependent upon him. His political government says to him he shall have the right to choose whomever he may desire to represent him in its legislative halls; the industrial baron, controlling his field of labor, says "support our candidate or you lose your job." The Creator of the universe has decreed "in the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread." His children must have food and shelter; his political government will not provide these. He must have employment, and so he obeys his industrial master, and in this way becomes a party to his own enslavement. The legislative body is polluted by the creatures of the great corporations, and its enactments are the dictations of the monopolists.

The public servants become the creatures of mercenary, soulless combinations, the Government but the tool of the monopolists, and its power is used to enforce the vassalage of the people whose rights and liberties it should safeguard and defend. The outcome of the system must logically be the destruction of popular government and the establishment of an industrial feudalism, more oppressive, more brutal, more tyrannical, than an Asiatic autocracy, and yet the farce, the pretense of popular government might be maintained.

The final result of this system of taxation must be the perversion and overthrow of our institutions. We have had warning sufficient; the evidence is before our eyes; if we fail to heed we have only ourselves to blame, and the stupidity and selfishness of poor human nature. Another grand vessel, freighted with the fate of millions of human beings will be wrecked upon the rock of human greed, human selfishness, by the stupidity and treachery of the directing head, and another black page will be added to the history of human governments.

Another great danger from the fostering and building up of these great monopolies and aggregations of capital is usually overlooked by the average citizen. It is the closing of great fields of industry against the individual, thus shutting him out from the opportunity of employment and enforcing idleness and suffering. This enforced idleness and the closing of the fields of industry against the productive energy of the nation is a crime against society as well as against the citizen.

It is to the interest of society to have the entire industrial force employed to its full capacity, and at the least cost to the individual. The building up of these great monopolies either shuts out this force from the opportunity to apply its productive energy to the greatest extent, or it is employed only at the greatest cost of the consumer. The result is a most serious hindrance and a vast reduction in the aggregate of produced values which the industrial energy of society is capable of creating if allowed. Production is limited by the greed of the monopolist, and only allowed to the extent that it is profitable to him. The interest of society is entirely ignored to further the mercenary advantage of this industrial dictator.

The trust, upon invading a field of industry, gains control of all producing plants. It then estimates what amount of production can command a certain profit, and then closes a sufficient number of plants to limit the output to this estimated quantity. The operatives in these closed plants are thrown out of employment; they are deprived of their means of support, and society of the product of their labor, for the profit of the monopolist.

In the great mineral, coal, and oil fields millions of acres are held idle and inaccessible to individual industry and capital in order that the monopolists may control the output and prices, thousands of industrious laborers are deprived of employment, and the people compelled to pay whatever demand the monopolist may choose to make for whatever they are compelled to use, and so the productive energy is reduced to the lowest limit in the interest of the monopolist instead of operated to the full limit in the interest of the people.

In many localities, within the past few years, prosperous and thriving communities engaged in certain industries have been practically destroyed by the closing down in this way of the plants upon which they depended for employment. Towns have been depopulated, or entire communities reduced to destitution and idleness for the purpose of adding to the profits of the trust and further increasing the fabulous aggregations of wealth possessed by the operators of these inhuman combinations.

People through ages have been accustomed to look only to political power and government as the source of danger to their liberties and encroachment upon their rights; but now we are menaced by dangers from another source, we are confronted by entirely

new conditions; yet it is true that these conditions have grown out of unwise or treacherous political policies.

This struggle for wealth is merely a new phase of the never-ending struggle for power. Money is the weapon of the modern "Conquistador," the modern social buccaneer. It is the same spirit which instigated Xerxes, Genghis Khan, William the Conqueror; indeed, it is the same spirit which instigated the armed conquest of every unfortunate people of which history tells the brutal and horrible tale.

It is the love of power conferred by wealth which is the inspiring motive. Wealth is power; centralized wealth is centralized power; distributed wealth is distributed power; the more equally the wealth of a nation is distributed among the people the more equally is the power divided. Centralized wealth is autocracy; distributed wealth is democracy. The policy which tends to centralize wealth in the hands of a few is the policy that will pull down the pillars which support the temple of our liberty. The brain that conceives or supports such a policy is a traitor to free institutions and free government. Not only is the policy which tends to centralize the wealth of a nation dangerous from a political and sociological point of view, but it is a deadly blight to the moral tone and character of the society in which it is possible.

The same influence which makes a tyrant makes a slave, and the influences growing out of existing conditions work in two directions, and are equally destructive in both. On the one hand they develop on the part of the fortunate and successful a spirit of arrogance; they become overbearing, self-asserting, heartless, and tyrannical, until they come finally to demand and compel whatever they may desire. Sympathy, the spirit of philanthropy, is destroyed, and they come to regard the common herd as mere brute animals, whose only mission is to serve their selfish purposes and to contribute to their pleasure and profit.

On the other hand, it makes the weak and unsuccessful treacherous, cruel, servile; it destroys their independence and manhood, makes them sycophants, sneaks, and toadies who fawn at the feet of power. To make high-toned, honorable, and manly men there must be preserved the pride of character, self-respect, and sense of independence that inspires to undertaking and restrains from servility, that gives courage to do right because it is honorable and to ignore mercenary ends where principle and honor are involved.

This centralization of wealth, then, which is the result of ill-conceived and wrongly adopted systems is undermining the moral tone of society; is warping the American character out of shape; is building up class distinctions and destroying the manhood of the rising generation; is gradually developing in this country the distinctions which have held Europe in the grasp of monarchy for ages. It is undermining the foundations of our institutions and poisoning the air of liberty which inspires our youth.

Call your institutions what you may; sing of the "glory of the flag" and the "equality" and "liberty" of your citizens; but it all ends in oratory and artificial enthusiasm. The cold fact remains that man is the slave of his necessities, and that man who has the power to command those necessities is the master of him enslaved by them. This is the secret of greed of wealth, and especially of aggregated wealth, and, so far from the enormous fortunes accumulated by the favored few being an evidence of our prosperity, they are the strongest evidence of our degeneracy, of the perversion of our institutions, and the dangers which are now menacing our people.

We boast of our prosperity, when the fact is of record that in fifty years—indeed, in thirty—we have degenerated from a nation of free home owners to a community 74 per cent of whom are homeless, a greater percentage than is known in Europe, except Great Britain. Thirty years ago practically the entire population was engaged in gainful employment. Whole communities are now shut out from their employment and their means of subsistence taken from them.

Fifty years ago the wives, and daughters, and dependent female relatives of manly American citizens were happy in their homes employed in a womanly way with their household affairs; to-day millions of these delicate and sensitive females are the slaves of the factory, the sweat shop, and the store, struggling for a pittance to keep life in their children and themselves, while their natural protectors are helpless to aid them, indeed forced into competition with them for the pittance they earn. Yes; this infamous system is bringing us to the plane of barbarism, making capital of their helplessness while it destroys the manhood of our men.

Prosperity has come to some, it is true, but to what class of our population? Surely not to the bone and sinew of the country, its only reliance in time of danger and darkness. Fifty years ago hunger and starvation were strangers to Americans; to-day they are visitors to many and feared by thousands. In our great centers of population destitution is so familiar that its misery fails to create a passing comment. The earnings of the industrial masses are swallowed up in the demands of the masters of industry for profit and added to their already fabulous hoardings.

The tax is so ingeniously arranged that the ragged laborer and coarsely clothed farmer pay for the gorgeous array of the manipulator of schemes. The farmer toils to produce from the earth the necessities of life, and the profit goes to the speculator. The mechanic produces, for a mere subsistence, wealth which is enjoyed by another. The miner risks his life in the darkness and filth and nauseous gases of the mine to bring to the light of day riches from the treasure-house of Pluto, to be disposed and enjoyed by another.

It seems a severe strain upon the principles of justice and the spirit of equity to claim that one man may be taxed and burdened in order that another may be enabled to succeed in his private business undertakings; but yet, if it were admitted that the protective system was excusable at the time of its enactment, under the plea of urgent necessity, when our manufacturing industries were in their infancy and required governmental aid to enable them to compete with those of older countries, still such an admission would not justify the continuance of this tyrannical outrage upon the great mass of our people at this time, when these industries have grown to be colossal institutions, many of them without parallel in the civilized world at any stage of its progression.

Had the manufactories been operated by the Government for the common benefit of the body politic, the equity of the system would be more apparent; but to levy a tax upon a man who must struggle for the necessities of life in order that another may amass a colossal fortune is straining the thread of justice to the breaking point. To-day our manufactories of every kind are not only able to compete with those of Europe, but they even threaten to monopolize certain lines of production. To-day the invasion of Europe by our manufacturers is more feared by European governments than an invasion of our armies would be.

In certain lines of production great numbers of factories have been closed in England and on the Continent and their machinery and operatives moved to this country in order to exist and to enjoy the advantage our tariff system gives. Nor has any resultant benefit come to our people from these years of burden and oppression to build up this system. Indeed, the injustice and oppression grows heavier and more overwhelming. While our manufacturers are enabled to compete with those of Europe in their own fields, and while they sell their product cheaper to the people of Europe than their manufacturers can, they recoup themselves by charging our own people more than they do those of foreign countries, including freight.

There are many articles that are manufactured in this country which can be bought in Europe or Mexico and transported back here for less cost than they could be bought at home. And why? Because our manufacturers can sell in foreign countries at the very least margin of profit, or even at a loss, and make up their shortage by charging home consumers enough in addition to a just price.

An illustration of this is prominent to-day in the steel industry. This may be truthfully called the "age of steel," as the use of this metal enters more generally into the consumption of every industry than any other material. Forty years ago our furnaces and forges were not of sufficient consequence to command notice. To-day they dominate the world, and within the past month a combination has been effected, capitalized at two thousand millions of dollars, and a half dozen men direct its operations and absorb its earnings. Why, a European king is a mere pigmy beside one of these giants. Its powers overshadow that of government. Before its money income the wealth of Croesus dwindles into a mere pittance. This giant of commerce threatens the peace of nations.

England, that for a century has controlled the steel trade of the world, stands aghast before this mighty colossus which threatens to extinguish her furnace fires and the light of her forges while her industrial people must starve. Germany fears for her industries, and Russia is powerless, with her mighty army and millions of people. This one commercial giant has filled Europe with trepidation and the world with amazement. It is the creation of our own injustice and folly. It sells its rails, its structural material, etc., in Russia, England, Germany, Egypt, anywhere, cheaper than it does at home, and no nation on earth can build ships for its navies or commerce, railroads for its transportation, or viaducts and bridges without directly or indirectly paying it tribute.

Compare such power as is here aggregated in the hands of a half dozen private men with that of the political ruler of a nation, and a slight conception may be had of what our policies may eventually develop, when it is taken into consideration that this is merely one of many great combinations of capital and power which such policies have evolved. This is more than a mere question of politics; it is a colossal sociological problem, upon which rests the perpetuity of our institutions, the liberty of our children.

We have been nourishing a lion's cub, which, grown to matu-

rity, will turn and rend us; we are creating a power which already overshadows our political Government, and whose heavy hand already presses upon the people and compels submission to its will regardless of their interest or rights. And, worse than all, the benefits of this system are purely sectional; indeed, confined to an extremely limited area and an infinitesimal proportion of our population.

The conditions prevailing in our country during the greater portion of the century after the foundation of our Government were such as to prevent the development of manufacturing industries except in this particular portion of the Northeast. The balance was entirely and exclusively agricultural and pastoral. This condition practically prevails to-day, and the South and West remain dependent upon agricultural industry, while the Northeast, where the social conditions were favorable, has continued to be the manufacturing section. During this century population has increased enormously throughout the vast extent of agricultural territory, while that of the manufacturing section has grown much more slowly.

The enormous aggregate of taxes (really profit to the manufacturers) paid by this immense agricultural population has been for decades flowing steadily into the pockets of these favored people and this favored section, until fortunes unparalleled have been built up on the one hand, and on the other the farms covered with mortgages and the people reduced to brutal struggle for the necessities of life. The fact is that this favored manufacturing section has been an incubus upon the agricultural regions of the West and South for the past forty years.

It has been a very "Old Man of the Sea" upon the shoulders of the agricultural Sinbad. It has been maintained by and its colossal fortunes amassed from the unjust burden put upon the West and South for its benefit. It has been sucking the lifeblood of Western and Southern industry until it is bloated with fullness and arrogant in its affluence. It has been maintained by its Western and Southern vassals until it begins to consider that it has a right to demand such tribute and uses the General Government to collect its tithes.

But, after all, the great and vital question naturally presents itself, "How are we to equalize the burdens to be borne by the people in the support of the Federal Government?" The Constitution provides that "no capitation or other direct tax shall be laid unless in proportion to the census or enumeration." Thus it will be seen that to levy a direct tax (such as is now levied upon property in the various States) would be contrary to the fundamental law of the land. It is seen that the only direct tax which Congress is authorized by the Constitution to levy is a per capita fixed by population, and here the changed conditions now existing become vividly apparent.

When the Constitution was framed our people were homogeneous; there were no great class distinctions; there was a community of interest; no overgrown wealth on the one hand and abject poverty on the other. There was a general, equitable distribution of property, and the entire country was exclusively agricultural. Under these conditions a per capita levy upon the enumerated population would represent as nearly an equitable distribution as could be arrived at, and what injustice might result would not have been a noticeable burden upon any citizen.

The clause was evidently designed to insure an equitable distribution, but changed conditions make this clause inoperative. Indeed, its enforcement would result in as flagrant injustice as that under which we now suffer. To illustrate, suppose we desired to raise a revenue of \$75,000,000 from a population of 75,000,000 people. The Constitution would require that a per capita of \$1 be assessed against each individual.

Now, this tax would be nothing to the millionaire, but would mean a whole day of toil to the laborer, leaving nothing for maintenance. It is unquestionable, then, that in order to enable Congress to levy a just and equitable tax for the maintenance of the Federal Government it is necessary that the Constitution be re-adapted to the changed conditions, and that it be made possible to levy a tax upon property, as is done now in every State, county, and municipality in the Union.

This is not only a proper action on the part of Congress, but a necessary one. The iniquitous system so long in vogue has, as I already said, compelled one section of the country to pay tribute to another to such an enormous extent that the one is reduced to penury and the other raised to affluence, all the wealth created by the industry of the one transferred into the pockets of the other. The taxes imposed upon the South and West to support the Federal Government and the protected industries of the North and East have plundered them to the extent that it has been almost impossible for the great mass of the people of those sections to accumulate more than the necessities of life, while in the protected sections fabulous fortunes have been amassed and luxury greater than was ever known even in imperial Rome enjoyed.

By this the very fundamental idea upon which our Constitution and Government were founded is destroyed—that of equality—and

class distinctions are being built up in express opposition to the spirit of our institutions. This being unquestionably true, it is beyond question the urgent duty of Congress to so amend the Constitution as to adapt it properly to existing conditions, and if possible reestablish that condition of equality which the founders of our Government struggled to provide.

The industrial power of the nation is enslaved and only its masters are prosperous. The gambler has been transmuted into the financier, and gambling has become the aristocratic calling for the élite. The stock gambler is the "Napoleon of finance," the schemer and sharper is the "business prodigy," the bucket-shop loafer is the "business man." Gamblers dictate the policy of the Government.

The darkest day for America and its institutions dawned when these policies were formulated. Is it reasonable to suppose that ordinarily intelligent people can always be deceived by such methods and held in servitude through deception? Hardly so. The time must come when a ray of intelligence will penetrate the brain of the sleeping lion and he will arouse himself in his own defense. Even this contingency has been provided for by the plotters, and when the time comes, as come it must, when the iron hand must strike to maintain established conditions it will be found ready gauntleted and armed.

The military branch of the organization has not been overlooked, and the Army and Navy are ready and prepared. The Army has been increased to a sufficient strength to insure prompt and efficient service. Extraordinary powers have been granted to the President until his powers to-day are greater than those in the hands of any potentate in Europe.

All is prepared, and when the patience of the people will bear no more then deception will be thrown to the winds and the tiger claws will spring forth from the velvet glove to rend and tear and slay, to maintain established systems and conditions treacherously imposed upon a long-suffering and patient people, and the iron hand of imperialism will lead us back, manacled and shackled, into the darkness of mediæval vassalage; or, it might possibly be, the bright spirit of liberty will lead us through the fires of revolution and desolation of war into the light of a new and advanced civilization, which will be the grandest and the noblest achievement of the human intellect and human valor, and build up a new social structure, from the summit of which our children's children will look back upon the systems and conditions of this time as we now look back upon those of the early autocracies or the hideous social nightmare of the middle ages.

River and Harbor Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. KING,

OF UTAH,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, January 15, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. KING said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If it were within my power I would prevent the passage of this bill. I have examined it with some care and am convinced that it is not such a measure as should secure the approval of this House. But any efforts to either amend this bill or prevent its passage will prove futile. During its consideration amendments have been offered by various members, but all have been rejected. No criticism, no matter how just, produces results; no proposition, however meritorious, if it changes the bill, is acceptable. There must be something more in the structure of this measure than is apparent upon the surface that renders it so invulnerable. It would be interesting for us and the country to know all of the reasons which have produced this invincible condition. It is supposed that when important measures are considered in the House, and especially in Committee of the Whole, they are imperfect, and that the discussions which ensue are advantageous to the extent of pointing out errors and suggesting how defects may be remedied. But river and harbor bills seem to be governed by a different rule. Some wonderful alchemist forms them and no earthly power can change them. Is it not wonderful that such supernatural powers are employed in the formation of these bills?

The genius and greatness of men are employed, and they bequeath to the world splendid works of art and mighty products of intellectual power. Governments are formed, nations are

founded; but with all their power and splendor the weakness of mortality and the touch of the finite are found, and ultimately death overtakes them. Man, the crowning creation of the Infinite, though he communes with the stars and comprehends eternities, fades away and is forgotten; but to those who see the stamp of imperfection upon all things and the seal of mortality and death everywhere, there is ground for courage, and their skepticism as to the creation of a perfect work can be removed when they are confronted by this superlatively perfect product—the river and harbor bill. So exquisite, so beautifully rounded, so symmetrical, artistic, and glorious in every particular, in every lineament and in every feature, is this more than human creation that all the power of Congress is unavailing to produce even the most infinitesimal change.

Great governmental questions are forgotten, mighty principles that involve the rights of the people and the integrity of the Government seem to be ignored when the proposition is presented to divide a portion of the Treasury among the people through the instrumentality of the river and harbor bill. Members darken the River and Harbor Committee room, and local committees haunt the corridors of the Capitol, importunate in their demands for gigantic appropriations for their respective sections. The Government is regarded as a great Fortunatus; the dispenser of riches, the giver of all gifts.

The repository of the people's delegated power is by this false view regarded as the source of power. The people, departing from the teachings of the fathers and the paths of safety, are investing the Federal Government with prohibited power and according to it an omnipotence that must excite the gravest apprehension for the future of the Republic in the minds of all thoughtful, patriotic citizens.

Authority is ascribed to it which is absolutely unauthorized, and which will, if usurped and possessed by the National Government, prove destructive of the liberty of the citizen and the sovereignty of the State.

We must return to the position that the General Government is a creature of limited powers; that it is circumscribed, restricted, and organized to preserve the individual and afford opportunity for the redemption which comes from self-effort. But under the modern view, with our false teachings, with our imperialistic tendencies, with our slavish reverence for power, with our eagerness to throw off the sovereignty of the citizen, to put upon the people the badge of servitude and take from the nation's brow the charter of our liberties and place thereon a crown symbolizing despotic power and unlimited authority, we turn from the precepts and examples of the past and use the Government as an engine for personal advancement, and are used by it for the aggrandizement and the profit of the few. This bill is not perfect either in structure or in detail. It is not exclusively national; it is not purely in the interest of commerce in the proper, legitimate, and constitutional sense. It is not a fair or honest work, nor does it come here with clear countenance and independent bearing. It has been charged during this debate that no matter what assaults may be made upon it, its passage is assured. Does it mean that there has been bargaining, and trafficking, and trading, and wire-pulling, and reciprocal considerations? If not, why this confidence and this supreme assurance, if not contemptuous effrontery?

Mr. CHAIRMAN, it is needless to talk in parables or riddles concerning this measure. This bill will pass; no power can prevent it: the local interests of enough sections have been cared for that all proceedings in the House are farcical. Why does the distinguished chairman permit discussion in the House? Why not move the previous question and pass the bill without a word of discussion or explanation? It could have been passed just as well two days ago or three days ago as now. It could as well pass now as tomorrow or next day.

Members are frequently heard to complain about the "inequalities" of the bill; and sometimes they will let it be known that while their particular proposition is of great importance and is entitled to consideration, other items of the bill are unjust, and the appropriations are unwarranted. Yet, when the weak places so designated by them are assaulted, no open support is given, and when the vote is called, such members are usually found supporting the committee and the appropriations, so earnestly by them condemned. So, we all know that when the whip is cracked members fall into line and support the bill in its entirety.

It is true there is occasional discontent, and here and there a slight protest is heard, but the protestant is soon silenced and the opposition is soon following meekly and obediently in the wake of this measure as it triumphantly marches through these legislative halls. When my friend from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN], like a gallant and heroic Don Quixote, attacked this measure and so clearly demonstrated its enormities, I thought there might be crystallized a sufficient opposition to present a formidable front. But I am doomed to disappointment. He is quiet now, and I am inclined to believe he will support the bill. Other gentlemen have

raised their voices in tumultuous cry, as if they would destroy the bill, but their voices are now stilled and all discordant sounds have been hushed.

The prospects of securing \$60,000,000 for distribution in most of the States is too alluring. If members fail to struggle for a portion of this "booty," their constituents are angered; no moral or constitutional questions can be interposed by Representatives to prevent this piratical benefaction. Is there not money in the Treasury? Are there not attenuated creeks and insignificant coves upon which work can be done and for which work contracts may be secured which will "put money in circulation?"

Thus it is reasoned, and so river and harbor bills are formed, recognition being given to unworthy and thieving propositions in order to secure needed appropriations for meritorious propositions. To improve great waterways and harbors, the Federal Government is compelled to care for hundreds of local streams and coast indentations. In order to do a proper thing a criminal act is performed. To improve "navigable" streams, millions of dollars are squandered on unnavigable ones.

Mr. Chairman, an examination of the various items contained in this bill conclusively demonstrates that it lacks the qualities of nationality. When the Constitution committed to Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with Indian tribes," it was not contemplated that the Federal Government should embark upon works of internal improvement that were purely local in their character.

It is not my purpose to analyze this constitutional provision and show the construction which has been placed upon it in the many adjudications by the Federal courts. I know that it is contended by some that under this grant to the Federal Government it has the power to undertake any work that conduces in the remotest degree to the development of commerce or industrial activity. Under this wide and unrestricted interpretation there would be no limitation whatever upon the power of the National Government. When it is contended that expediency is alone the question that is addressed to the legislative branch of the Government, then indeed is the Constitution a rope of sand.

The roads and bridges and highways are connected with commerce, no matter how local and provincial they may be. The minutest vein or artery is a part of the human system; the country lane over which passes the rude cart in one sense is related to the commercial system of the country; every wagon that carries a tree which is to be converted into timber or the finished product, is an instrument of commerce; the winding mountain stream down which floats the timber that has been taken from the mountain tops has some relation to commerce. And yet how it would shock the ideas of the people if we said the Federal Government under its power to regulate commerce, could improve the country roads and lanes and build bridges over the streams in our mountain fastnesses, and span the small creeks that meander through the meadows in our fertile prairie States.

This grant of power has been perverted; it has been distorted and is now used for the purpose of plundering the Treasury and squandering millions in improper and illegitimate enterprises. Members speak about the increase of commerce, and then gravely assure the House that it is the direct result of this class of appropriations. We would have had commerce without a dollar appropriated by river and harbor bills. We had commerce upon the Mississippi River before the Government had expended millions in wasteful, profitless surveys and undertakings.

This constitutional provision is to be reasonably and sensibly considered. The jealousies of the colonists and the impediments offered by them which restricted commerce between the colonies led to the investment in the Federal Government of the power to regulate commerce. The principal purpose was to prevent the States from imposing duties and tariffs upon articles imported from one State into another; but under this proper grant of power we are now establishing a system so meretricious and far-reaching in its evil consequences that it should arouse the attention of all who desire the perpetuation of constitutional government.

It is clear that the constitutional grant to the Federal Government for the regulation of commerce is not an unrestricted power to undertake any enterprise and engage in any business which might remotely be connected with commercial activities. It was not intended by the framers of the Constitution that the Federal Government should engage in pursuits which of necessity belong to private enterprise, nor in undertakings of a State character. The work of the parent Government is national, not local. Transportation companies are engaged in commerce. Manufacturers, with their multifarious productions of farm and field and forge and mill, contribute to the development of commerce. If, as some Republicans contend, the entire subject of commerce is by the Constitution committed to the Federal Government and there is no inhibition upon its power to build roads and bridges and highways and employ all the concomitants that belong to commerce, then, instead of this being a republic, it is a stupendous socialistic organization.

Under the view expressed by some, Congress could assume control of all the arteries and channels of trade and commerce, the instrumentalities employed in the development of commerce, and the production of the multifarious creations which are the outgrowth of our marvelous industrial development. If Congress is determined in this matter only by the question of expediency, a most tyrannous and dangerous power rests in the Federal Government. Such an interpretation as this is monstrous, and converts the Republic into a despotism which in time will prove unendurable.

This latitudinarian and vicious construction goes to the extent of vesting in Congress power to create commerce, and so the Treasury of the United States is to be placed in the keeping of individuals who desire to supplement and improve the works of the Almighty, and make rivers where none exist and harbors where none is found or desired. This bill ought to be labeled "A bill to plunder the people and make trout streams navigable rivers, and mill ponds and sandy beaches international harbors."

If the Federal Government has power to enter a State and expend hundreds of millions of dollars to convert sluggish, tortuous, insignificant, dribbling creeks into such proportions, by building locks and dams and joining other streams with them, that currents sufficiently large to float flatboats and a few saw logs are formed, the conclusion, of course, must be irresistible that the Government can construct highways, build railroads, and engage in the multitudinous industrial and commercial pursuits that engage individual endeavor.

The Constitution does not confer such unbridled power upon Congress in this regard. A few years ago a citizen of Ohio marshaled unemployed men and marched to the capital of the nation. Doubtless he had read of the great viaducts, causeways, and highways constructed in the days of imperial Rome, and deduced the proposition that this Republic would parallel this gigantic national work. Coxeyism was ridiculed and men were not wanting to denounce the scheme as wild and chimerical as well as unconstitutional, and yet if the provisions of this bill are to be carried out, and others of a similar character, the demands of Coxey become respectable when a comparison is instituted.

It is the fashion now for every man who lives upon the seashore to ask to have a harbor constructed abutting upon his land, and he and his friends and all the influences which can be commanded are skillfully and persistently employed, first to create a local sentiment favorable to the scheme, then to secure the cooperation of the Representative of the district; then to subsidize the press, and lastly to assault Congress, and by logrolling, and jobbery, and deals, and trades, and bargaining, secure an appropriation from the Federal Treasury.

An examination of this bill and the engineer's reports, as well as other data accompanying it, show that little streams 2 feet in depth and 20 or 30 feet in width that rise in some interior county in a State and not connected with any other State, are deemed of sufficient importance to warrant governmental supervision and Federal appropriations under the pretense of regulating "commerce with foreign nations and among the several States." As I remember, it has been admitted upon the floor during this discussion, when attention was challenged to one inconsequential brook, that small boats of sand were floated a few miles to a town below. This was the commerce upon the stream. How important this was to the people of the United States to be able to float upon the broad expanse of a mighty torrential stream 2 feet deep and 20 feet wide a few loads of sand!

How beneficent is the reign of this Government and how stupendous are its achievements!

Later we may expect to see the engineers, the great men of science, employed by the Government, engaged in mighty engineering feats in determining how to deepen and widen and improve the brooks upon the farms of the people of the United States in order that they may float their cord wood from one part of the farm to another. This would be a "regulation of commerce." Cord wood is an article of commerce; it enters into the wants of man and is an important adjunct to the comfort if not the civilization of the people.

It was never contemplated that the public Treasury should be employed for any such purposes as are set forth in many of the provisions of this bill. If there is no rule, no limitation whatever upon Congress, no fixed principle which is to determine the character of these appropriations and the place of their expenditure, then the work of plunder will rapidly increase and the consequent burdens upon the people will be multiplied, because the success of each illegitimate scheme is chronicled throughout the country and engenders a desire upon the part of other sections to the same ignoble and criminal efforts.

It is a familiar rule that one bad precedent is soon followed by similar wrongs. An example of this fact is discovered in the appropriations made by the Federal Government for fairs and expositions. If one State receives an appropriation for an exposition it encourages others to organize expositions, oftentimes being stimulated in their efforts by the fact that they expect an appro-

priation from Congress; so that now it is becoming a profitable business industry to promote expositions and fairs and "Pan-American" exhibitions, and to organize raids upon the Federal Treasury. Private corporations are formed, and when a small amount of capital stock is subscribed a lobby is organized and the halls of Congress invaded, persuasive arguments are used, the bad precedents established are cited, and it is claimed that, the Federal Government having aided Philadelphia and Chicago and Atlanta and Nashville and New Orleans and Buffalo, it would be an unjust discrimination to not now give liberally for St. Louis and Charleston.

Then the promoters appeal to the boards of trade of other large cities and to prominent citizens as well as speculators and real-estate boomers and stock jobbers in other sections in which expositions at the expense of the Federal Government have not yet been held, and they combine for the purpose of crystallizing sentiment in favor of expositions, expecting ere long, under this stimulating policy, to launch one in their own section. They insiduously commence work with their Representatives and Senators to support the schemes that are then before Congress for grabs upon the Treasury for expositions for which such organizations are at work.

In this way opposition is broken down, members who are opposed to such a policy gradually relinquish their opposition, because of the persistent forces operating upon them from their own sections, until at last the scheme is triumphant and the crown of success is placed upon the brow of private scheme and jobbery. The people of one section of the State learn that hundreds of thousands of dollars have been procured for other parts of the State and they demand the same consideration for their section.

It is charged that persons are sometimes named for Congress because of their promised support of the propositions to secure Federal appropriations for purely local purposes, and doubtless many Representatives, responding to the demand of their constituents, give their splendid abilities to the consummation of plans which take millions from the Treasury of the United States for unconstitutional and paternalistic purposes, and for rivers and harbors that are not interstate, that can not within the letter or spirit of the Constitution become legitimate charges upon the National Treasury.

As I have stated, it has become a profession to organize raids upon the Treasury of the United States and to devise schemes to advance local and private interests at the expense of all the people. The game of grab, which used to be played secretly and with finesse, is now an open, defiant, flagrant, and corrupt one.

An overflowing treasury is a constant temptation to the good and patriotic to pass the bounds of decency and constitutional propriety, and is regarded as legitimate plunder by the evil-minded in the land. Such a condition of the Treasury stands as a command to the lawless and corrupt, and to those who love paternalism, to lay their impious hands upon the sacred patrimony of the people. It is not statesmanship to have a surplus in the Treasury; the interests of the people would be far better subserved if there was a slight deficit at the end of each year. A budget which contemplates a surplus in the Treasury at the end of the year is fraught with mischief to the people. If a man lies down with thieves he will be robbed.

The means for robbing the Treasury of the United States are so numerous that if a surplus is exacted from the people by our fiscal agencies, all the cunning and ingenuity of the speculator and corporation promoter and coupon clipper and subsidy grabber and trust plunderer and capitalistic pirate, will be employed to filch it from the people. A lean treasury not only produces economy but it enforces honesty.

Returning to the question under discussion, it is highly amusing to hear the criticisms often publicly made on the floor, but more frequently made in private by members of the pending bill. I have heard it said by some that they could not afford to antagonize the bill, because their sections were to be benefited by appropriations in the bill, although they knew that other sections had been permitted to secure, through jobs and schemes, appropriations in the bill which should be held up to public execration. Some have admitted that they were obtaining more, perhaps, than their little meadow brooks and straggling streams deserved, but other streams which, if possible, were smaller and less consequential received larger appropriations than theirs, so there was justification for opposing no one proposition and supporting all.

Thus the cohesive power of plunder is so great that these heterogeneous elements are molded together into a powerful, strong, and harmonious whole. I am afraid that some of our friends upon the floor, in the language of Shakespeare, are wont to exclaim:

I do here perceive a divided duty.

And so to my friends, and especially to my Democratic friends who are championing this measure and participating in this carnival of riotous and extravagant corruption, these other words of the great poet are commended:

Confess yourself to heaven;
Repent what's past; avoid what is to come.

This bill is a "king of shreds and patches," a bundle of contraries, a misshapen mass, containing a few virtues and many vices.

But, Mr. Chairman, a policy which involves appropriations such as these must excite the apprehension of patriotic Representatives. They must be asking themselves the question, Where is the end to be? If the success of a Representative is measured by the amount of appropriations which he can obtain, by the standard of dollars and cents to his district, if there is no limitation upon Congress and no rule of conduct, there will some day be a fearful reckoning.

Each session the applications for the survey of new streams never yet heard of and new harbors never yet dreamed of are made. From the thousands of waterways that I am learning of since I came to Congress I am constrained to believe that our country is all rivers and harbors, with only sufficient fringes of land to constitute banks and shores. The applications and petitions for additional surveys, in the language of one speaker, "come here by basketfuls." The survey of a moderate-sized stream and a successful application for an appropriation, engenders a desire for an appropriation for a smaller stream, and that whets the appetite for further spoils to improve still smaller streams, and so on ad infinitum.

There seems to be no plan, no purpose, no system. No scheme stands upon its own merits, but all are united. The wise and proper projects are used to cover the vices and sins of the unwise and improper ones, and when the measure is reported its proponents and defenders employ much eloquence and rhetorical display, as well as verbal pyrotechnics, about our "mighty commerce" and the "old flag" in order to hide the infamies of the proposed bill. As a result the good projects are weighted with the bad, and all are enveloped in suspicion, if not branded with disrepute. There are hundreds of propositions in this bill for which appropriations are made, and under the policy we are pursuing there will be thousands in bills which follow. Sixty millions of dollars are appropriated by this bill, and yet not a project is completed, not a harbor is regarded as finished, nor the improvements upon any stream, though they have reached millions, deemed sufficient.

After decades of this work there is nothing complete; everything is fragmentary and piecemeal; no project is taken up and steadily pursued until it is finished; and if the improvements are continuous, so imperfect have been the engineering plans or so unskillful has been the execution that completion is as remote now as it was years ago. If a harbor is excavated to-day according to the plans prepared, to-morrow agitation is commenced for other improvements and for a mammoth enlargement of it, and the lobby is organized and the campaign commenced to convince Congress that if the harbor is a thousand feet wide, it should be 2,000 feet wide, and if it is 30 feet deep, it should be 40 feet deep.

It is stated by the chairman of the committee that the estimates before him show a demand for \$300,000,000. What will these demands be when other streams and harbors are surveyed? Estimates increase each year; there is no limit. If it should appropriate at once the three hundred millions covered by the estimates submitted by the engineers, before the amount was half expended the estimates would be still greater.

I do not hesitate to charge that much of the many millions appropriated is needlessly and riotously squandered. Who does not know that the boats upon the Mississippi are far less numerous now than they were fifty years ago? With the millions of dollars expended for the alleged improvement of the Mississippi River in making it more navigable, it is less navigable now than it was then.

My distinguished friend from Louisiana, General MEYER, has stated that formerly the South in bills of this character "was neglected and, I believe, almost ignored." This can not be said now, and the thought irresistibly is forced upon one that perhaps the recognition accorded to the South in these regular steals, results from a desire to secure votes in order to insure the passage of the measures rather than from any particular wish to expend Government money in the States referred to.

It is apparent to all observers that the millions of dollars appropriated upon the Mississippi and Missouri rivers have not all been expended for the purpose of making the river navigable. The only justifiable ground upon which the appropriations could be predicated—namely, to aid commerce—has been abandoned, and the public Treasury has been used for the purpose of protecting the private property of individuals in the Mississippi and Missouri valleys. The navigability of the rivers has ceased to be the controlling question; preservation of the property of the people is the prime consideration. It is a matter, of course, to be deplored that the lands contiguous to those rivers are subjected to inundation, but to prevent such catastrophes is not sufficient warrant for the violation of the Constitution and the invasion of the Treasury of the United States.

I have been interested in reading about the harbors and ports of entry along the Great Lakes. It is a rather remarkable coincidence that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BISHOP], who is

a member of this committee, and who represents that portion of Michigan which borders upon the lake bearing the same name, is not content with one harbor, but wants appropriations for multitudes of little inlets and indentations and curves and crooks upon the shores of Lake Michigan. Every county bordering the lake has not one but many "harbors." And I find in Wisconsin that every little town bordering upon the lake wants a harbor. Of course, the specious plea is advanced that it is in the interest of commerce, and that the harbor reduces freight rates and facilitates the transportation of products to market. And I find that the little brooks and creeks in New Jersey and South Carolina and other States referred to in the bill, receive mammoth appropriations, though they are unknown even to Representatives from those States, and many of which scarcely flow beyond the counties in which they rise.

To give them importance the brush and sticks and timbers which are floated upon them are called tonnage, and fictitious columns of figures are builded up to show the fabulous and almost inconceivable volume of business freighted upon their "broad bosoms." And the same reports submitted by the engineers show that when there is insufficient water to float a little boat unless the water is confined, elaborate systems of locks and dams are provided at a cost of millions. In this manner sufficient water can be confined in a small section of the creek to carry a small boat, and then it is gradually released and held by the lock and dam below so as to permit the passage of the boat a few feet farther down.

It is absurd and ridiculous to call this a regulation of commerce, and it is grossly wrong to employ the public Treasury to further such schemes.

I am told that it will cost more than \$20,000,000 to put locks and dams in the upper part of the Ohio River. If it is estimated roughly at twenty millions, it means fifty millions. If this plan is to be continued, I fully concur in the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] that it would be advantageous to move the coal fields to the streams that are navigable rather than to attempt the labor of making the streams navigable to the coal fields. If Congress is justified in appropriating for the improvement of rivers and harbors it must be clearly apparent that the work is national and of such broad proportions as to come within the characterization of interstate commerce. But this bill does not answer this purpose. It is overflowing with local, and private, and State, and provincial propositions. Hundreds of appropriations herein provided for are absolutely devoid of Federal quality or national import. They are so local and provincial and so private and individual in character as to be unworthy of a place within any river and harbor bill passed by even a State legislature. Some of them are fit matters for individual enterprise, scarcely rising to the dignity of being considered by a county or precinct.

How can the expenditure of public money be justified under such conditions? Before this heedless, reckless, unconstitutional method was adopted of legislating for rivers and harbors, individuals, local communities, and States gave their attention to these questions. Before the war many of the Southern States made appropriations for their local streams. With the all-absorbing plan adopted by the Federal Government of developing and controlling every drop of water within the United States and every indentation upon its shores, individual effort, local expenditure, and State control have almost entirely ceased. And why not? If this work can be devolved upon the Federal Government, the responsibility of its assumption will not be taken by the people. Instead of the National Government endeavoring to reduce the number of navigable streams and harbors and points over which to exercise jurisdiction, the policy seems to be to reach out in every direction, usurp the rights and powers of the States, and control absolutely those matters which are properly within the jurisdiction of individuals or the sovereign States. It is a wrong to the people and an injury not only to the State, but to the Federal Government, to place it in such a questionable position.

During the discussion yesterday my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] referred to the fact that one of the streams in his State, which is now the subject of national consideration and control, was formerly kept in repair by the State. It is purely a State stream, of local character, and in no sense a proper charge upon the Federal Government. But under this demoralizing policy which produces river and harbor bills the State escapes expense in caring for the stream and it becomes a parasite upon the General Government.

If this course is adhered to much longer there will be no local improvement by any State or individual which affects the streams. Already the scandalous policy of caring for the bridges of railroads and corporations which span rivers is being pursued. And we hear of railroad corporations actively encouraging agitation in favor of rivers and harbors. Of course the reason for such apparently inexplicable conduct is found in the fact that when the appropriation is expended a large portion is employed in protecting the river banks in the locality of the railroad bridges and in buttressing and preserving the bridges themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks that the time of the gentleman from Utah be extended. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FINLEY. The gentleman states that the Pedee River, South Carolina, is local and not national in its character. I wish to call his attention to the fact that he is entirely in error in making that statement. The Great Pedee River is one of the largest rivers in South Carolina, the longest river in the State, and its head in North Carolina near the Tennessee line, flows through that State and through the State of South Carolina and empties into the Atlantic Ocean. This river is as national in its character as any other river for which an appropriation is made in this bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, nothing my friend has said will lead me to qualify remarks which I have made with reference to that river. I predicated my reference to the stream mentioned upon the statement of the gentleman in his remarks yesterday that only a few years ago the State of South Carolina appropriated for the repair of this river in order to make it navigable and otherwise assumed control over it.

I could not censure my friend for coming here now and asking Congress to relieve the State from the burden of caring for this stream, inasmuch as it is turning loose a golden stream from the Treasury to furnish fat contracts for the improvement of hundreds of smaller streams in various parts of the Union. But his statement corroborates what I was charging, viz, that the river and harbor policy of the Government results in saddling upon Congress works that are not national and which belong to the States or to private persons.

Mr. Chairman, it is only necessary to allude to the increased appropriations for rivers and harbors to show the voracity of this modern Moloch.

In 1870 an appropriation of \$2,000,000 was made for rivers and harbors, the largest any bill had ever carried theretofore for that purpose. The amounts then rapidly increased until in President Arthur's term the river and harbor bill carried nearly \$19,000,000. He regarded the measure as so iniquitous that he interposed a veto, but Congress quickly passed the bill over the President's objection. In 1882 the estimates submitted by the engineers called for only \$37,000,000; now they demand \$300,000,000. Numerous appropriations followed, the amount carried in 1891 being \$25,000,000. In 1896 this hungry monster could be satisfied with nothing short of \$80,000,000.

It is known to all that, had it not been for the extraordinary expenditures of the Government during the last four years, occasioned by the extravagance of the Administration and the execution of its military and colonial policies, this bill would have carried at least \$100,000,000. I am free to confess that, if the people are to be taxed and robbed, I would prefer to see the revenues squandered in creeks and swamps and inlets than in the gaudy trappings of military power and in efforts to destroy the germs of a republic in the Orient and embark our country upon the perilous and destroying sea of imperialism.

I wish I had the time to compare the bill vetoed by President Arthur with the one under consideration. If that was so unconstitutional and obnoxious because of its local qualities, this is doubly so. If that was bad, this is damnable. The wise and patriotic utterances of President Arthur I respectfully commend to my friends on both sides of this Chamber. Here are some of his splendid sentiments:

My principal objection to the bill is that it contains appropriations for purposes not for the common defense or general welfare, and which do not promote commerce among the States. These provisions, on the contrary, are entirely for the benefit of the particular localities in which it is proposed to make improvements. I regard such appropriation of the public money as beyond the powers given by the Constitution to the Congress and the President.

I feel the more bound to withhold my signature from the bill because of the peculiar evils which manifestly result from this infraction of the Constitution. Appropriations of this nature, to be devoted purely to local objects, tend to an increase in number and amount. As the citizens of one State find that money, to raise which they, in common with the whole country, are taxed, is to be expended for local improvements in another State, they demand similar benefits for themselves, and it is not unnatural that they should seek to indemnify themselves for such use of the public funds by securing appropriations for similar improvements in their own neighborhood. Thus as the bill becomes more objectionable it secures more support. This result is invariable and necessarily follows a neglect to follow the constitutional limitations imposed upon the lawmaking power.

The appropriations for river and harbor improvements have, under the influences to which I have alluded, increased year by year out of proportion to the progress of the country, great as that has been. In 1870 the aggregate appropriation was \$3,975,900; in 1875, \$6,648,517.50; in 1880, \$8,976,500; and in 1881, \$11,451,000; while by the present act there is appropriated \$18,743,875.

The extravagant expenditure of the public money is an evil not to be measured by the value of that money to the people who are taxed for it. They sustain a greater injury in the demoralizing effect produced upon those who are intrusted with official duty through all the ramifications of Government.

Mr. Chairman, in remarks heretofore submitted, I stated that

the plan of combining all projects in one bill was demoralizing, and that each proposition should be considered separately.

President Pierce, as early as December 30, 1854, became cognizant of the evil and vice of the present system of legislation upon this question. Accordingly, he recommended that "Every work should be in a separate bill, so that each one shall stand on its own independent merit."

President Jackson refused his assent to a bill for the improvement of certain rivers and harbors.

The words of this great Democrat are so pertinent to the matter now under consideration, and indicate so clearly the pernicious effects of the present policy, that I feel constrained to invite the attention of members to the same:

In former messages I have expressed my conviction that the Constitution does not warrant the application of the funds of the General Government to objects of internal improvement which are not national in their character, and both as a means of doing justice to all interests and putting an end to a course of legislation calculated to destroy the purity of the Government, have urged the necessity of reducing the whole subject to some fixed and certain rule. * * * Without some general and well-defined principles ascertaining these objects of internal improvement to which the means of the nation may be constitutionally applied, it is obvious that the exercise of the power can never be satisfactory. Besides the danger to which it exposes Congress of making hasty appropriations to works of the character of which they may be frequently ignorant, it promotes a mischievous corrupting influence upon elections by holding out to the people the fallacious hope that the success of a certain candidate will make navigable their neighboring creek or river, bring commerce to their doors, and increase the value of their property. It thus favors combinations to squander the treasure of the country upon a multitude of local objects, as fatal to just legislation as to the purity of public men. * * *

There is no excuse for the assumption of doubtful powers by the General Government. If those which are clearly granted shall be found incompetent to the ends of its creation, it can apply at any time for their enlargement; and there is no probability that such an application, if founded in the public interest, will ever be refused.

Being solemnly impressed with the conviction that the extension of the power to make internal improvements beyond the limit I have suggested, even if it be deemed constitutional, is subversive of the best interests of our country, I earnestly recommend to Congress to refrain from its exercise in doubtful cases, except in relation to improvements already begun, unless they shall procure from the States such an amendment of the Constitution as will define its character and prescribe its bounds. * * * Both governments are the governments of the people, improvements must be made with the money of the people, and if the money can be collected and applied by these more simple and economical political machines, the State governments, it will unquestionably be safer and better for the people than to add to the splendor the patronage and the power of the General Government. (Vol. 4, Messages and Papers.)

May 29, 1896, Mr. Cleveland vetoed a river and harbor bill which was less objectionable than this. His characterization of its demoralizing effects and evil tendencies could be repeated again, and with more than justice applied to the mean, miserable, dishonest bill which will soon be rushed through this House. These are his words:

A more startling feature of this bill is its authorization of contracts for river and harbor work amounting to more than \$22,000,000. * * *

Many of the objects for which it appropriates public money are not related to the public welfare, and many of them are palpably for the benefit of limited localities or in aid of individual interests. * * *

On the face of the bill it appears that not a few of these alleged improvements have been so improvidently planned and presented that after an unwise expenditure of millions of dollars new experiments for their accomplishment have been entered upon. * * * Whatever items of doubtful propriety may have escaped observation, or may have been tolerated in previous Executive approval of similar bills, I am convinced that the bill now under consideration opens the way to insidious and increasing abuses, and is in itself so extravagant as to be especially unsuited by these times of depressed business and resulting disappointment in Government revenue. To the extent that the appropriations contained in this bill are instigated by private interests and promote local or individual profits their allowance can not fail to stimulate a vicious paternalism and encourage a sentiment among our people, already too prevalent, that their attachment to our Government may properly rest upon the hope and expectation of direct and special favors and that the extent to which they are realized may furnish an estimate of the value of governmental care. I believe no greater danger confronts us as a nation than the unhappy decadence among our people of genuine and trustworthy love and affection for our Government as the embodiment of the highest and best aspirations of humanity and not as the giver of gifts, and because its mission is the enforcement of exact justice and equality and not the allowance of unfair favoritism.

Mr. Chairman, I am at somewhat of a loss to understand the attitude which some of my friends on this side of the House assume toward this bill. While condemning Republicanism and the centralizing, unconstitutional policies and legislation of the party in power, they defend this iniquitous, special, paternalistic, and unconstitutional measure. And they tell us that Calhoun revised his charter of Democratic faith and the Bible by which he had been guided in his political course, and assented to the dogma that the Federal Government had the power constitutionally to engage in internal improvements. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] made that declaration a few days ago. My understanding of the Democratic principles is entirely different from the view which prevails, as evidenced by the votes and speeches of gentlemen upon this side of the Chamber, with respect to the fundamental principles of that immortal and undying creed.

Mr. Chairman, with the teachings of great Democrats before us, with the undimmed and enduring principles of Democracy for our guide, no Democrat need be in doubt as to his duty. It is un-Democratic to use the Federal Government to further private or per-

sonal ends. In my humble opinion, it is indefensible for any Democrat, even though he can succeed, to attempt to use the Treasury of the United States to aid in improvements that are personal or local. When Republicans are looting the Treasury and seeking to employ the Government to benefit the few, the duty is, if possible, stronger than ever for the Democrats to defend the people and the Constitution and keep their hands clean.

The Democratic party is the custodian of those sacred principles of liberty and constitutional government which were so gloriously vindicated by our fathers and were committed to us for perpetuation. Democrats can not afford to wander in the wilderness of unbelief and follow the heresies so triumphantly proclaimed in these evil hours.

The party of Jefferson, though encompassed by powerful foes and though scourged and driven from power, still lives. Its banner is still proudly flying, and it looks forth with confidence and courage to the dawn of a brighter day.

Its mission can never end until man everywhere is enfranchised, his equality recognized, and the sanctity of personal liberty is assured and the inviolability of life confessed.

The darkness of the present hour, the despotic, tyrannous, corrupting course of the Administration, while it may dishearten some and purchase the faith and manhood of others, must finally yield to the reign of law and the freedom of right.

This is not the hour for despair. "To despair is to desert."

In this shocking state of idolatry, this criminal abandonment of the faith and traditions of the past, it becomes all lovers of the Constitution to hold fast their faith and with serenity and unshaken devotion meet the assaults upon the citadel of constitutional morality, which they heroically should defend. They should be—

The guardians of an altar
Midst the silence of the sky,
The watchers of a beacon
Whose fire must never die.

It is so easy to drift with the tide, to talk of and profit by commercialism, to regard with favor the glittering prospects of national glory secured by war and conquest. It flatters our pride to be told that ours is "a world power," that the kingdoms of the earth are impressed with our military renown, and regard with favor our embarkation upon the wide sea of colonialism. It is no easy task to maintain stoical indifference to the blandishments offered by an imperial career.

It is so easy to excuse unconstitutional policies by arguing the glory and benefits to be derived. Crime has always a defender. The destruction of free government will always have eloquent apologists.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in my country, in her institutions. I love her flag and revere that sacred ground upon which it was reared. I desire to see the temple thereon reared, so impregnable as to defy the assaults of time or man, and the ensign of our country float forever as the unsullied symbol of liberty and free government.

But there is no promise of immortality to our Government except by unswerving allegiance to the right and the maintenance of constitutional government in all of its vigor. Truth and liberty grow only upon consecrated soil. If it is desecrated by sin, by greed, by a "sordid despotism of wealth," by the unholly appetite for conquest, by the blood of those who seek to struggle up from the twilight into the radiance of freedom's day, by the cruel, heartless, hypocritical, covetous, mercenary conduct of the present Administration, then the products of such soil, beautiful and divine as they appear, will fade away, leaving us with the wreck of our mad ambitions and disappointed aspirations.

Mr. Chairman, measures of this kind are like Pandora's box. They breed discontent among the people and whet the appetite for further contributions from the Treasury of the United States. They dam up the springs of private enterprise, of State expenditure, and divert the attention of the people from self-effort and local endeavor. They breed false conceptions in the minds of the people as to the power and purposes of the Federal Government. They degrade the States in the minds of the people and minify their usefulness and power. The people are taught to appeal to Congress for all things. Legislation of this kind is to-day undermining the patriotism of the people; it is breeding a spirit of paternalism that will prove destructive of the sovereignty of the States. Any observer of current events, of political and economic conditions, can not close his eyes to the dangerous conditions confronting us.

The people are demoralized; their relation to the Federal Government and to their State governments is misunderstood. The limitations of the Federal Government and the powers of the States are not comprehended. Self-reliance is at a discount. Individualism is swallowed up in nationalism; the purpose is to crown the nation and to uncrown the individual, to exalt the aggregate power and to degrade the individual strength and authority. Rome's decadence was clearly apparent when the pernicious spirit of paternalism prevailed. The Roman people were in the enjoyment

of their greatest prosperity when they relied upon personal effort, jealously guarded their local rights and liberties, demanded that the hand of the government should rest lightly upon them, and that taxation should be limited to the needs of the government, economically administered. Rome was glorious, and her citizenship was regal. But dark hours came and local self-government was dishonored.

The government became the source of power, not the people, and with this great transformation in the minds of the people came a greater metamorphosis in the governmental system. Despotism was looked upon as normal, kingly power as legitimate, and the right of the few to govern the many, in consonance with the purposes of Providence. Class distinctions divided the people, and with social inequality came industrial inequality. With social dishonor came political degradation. The government, being the source of power, by the same philosophy must be the arbiter of the weal or woe of the people. If it builds the roads and bridges and constructs public works and undertakes socialistic policies, why not till the farm and care for the people, and furnish them wheat and corn and wine, and distribute among them money in the market place? And so individualism decayed, nationalism swallowed up the people, and tyranny followed, and then national decay and destruction.

The people are the springs, the sources of wealth and power, and from these springs flow the gentle waters that carry blessings to the local and Federal Governments. But if the Government is regarded as the spring from which flows the holy waters, then the land will be barren and the fertile fields will be turned to desolation. We are witnessing in our country to-day a change of sentiment amongst the people. The power of Congress is invoked in matters never committed to the Federal Government. Individuals are willing to prostitute the taxing power of the Government to crush legitimate competition; oppressive laws and discriminating legislation are imposed upon the people; taxation is unjust; wealth is protected; caste is created; millions are purloined from the Treasury for local purposes and private ends, and the functions of government transferred to banks and favored classes.

Schemes are daily being devised for the purpose of obtaining moneys from the Federal Treasury. New offices are created by the thousand, and Administration henchmen and political prostitutes swarm like an offensive pest to fill them and fleece the people. The rapacity of the people is unbounded. Men in public station are praised not because of their devotion to country and principle, their statesmanship, their pure lives, their love of the Constitution, their years of patient toil to learn the great principles of liberty, their love of humanity, or their self-sacrificing lives, but because of the facility with which they can plunder the public Treasury, secure appropriations for the districts or States within which they reside, and find new positions for the ever-increasing, devouring army that feeds on the people. This standard of measurement is too often applied, especially to those who occupy positions in this House and in the other legislative branch of the Government. Members are constantly besought by their districts to obtain appropriations, no matter how unworthy the object.

To such a degree has this pernicious, insidious, and demoralizing idea obtained, and so strongly has it entrenched itself in the country, that to-day we often find persons in public life justifying their efforts by showing that other persons by their zeal in this illegal and criminal course, have secured great benefits for their localities, and that if such a policy is pursued they should see that their sections are not forgotten. Election to office by some is regarded as a commission to engage in predatory warfare upon the Government. People boldly defend this course and measure the worthiness of public officers by the success with which they can invade the Treasury. We hear of strong, high-minded, public-spirited men defeated for office because they have been unwilling to exploit the Treasury in the interest of their districts; and the counterpart is often witnessed, as we hear of men who are promoted because of their success in this purely piratical course. When the Dingley bill was under consideration honorable persons boldly declared that if robbery and plunder were to be employed they purposed getting a full share for their districts and States.

Mr. Chairman, there never was a time in the history of our country when there was so little genuine patriotism and that loyalty to the truth so essential to moral supremacy and governmental integrity. I admit there is much "dollar-mark" patriotism; much of the brass-button, high-vaunting variety. It seems as if the people are drifting from their moorings. They are dazzled by the lights which dance upon the tempestuous and dangerous seas. The harbors so securely locked and prepared by the fathers seem to be small and the great bounding sea appears so inviting. The cry of "destiny" and not duty is heard; the voice of glory and not honor and safety is followed. Truth and principle are at a discount, and the inspiration that gave life and being to this Republic is forgotten. The fundamental principles upon which rests the

fabric of this great nation are regarded as obsolete and antiquated. New "isms" are wanted as new times appear. There is no fixity in life; new creeds are to be developed with new centuries. Men in high places attack the Constitution and declare it insufficient for our wants. They say that it hinders our progress, hampers our development, and that it is not the part of wisdom to be governed by it.

They forget that it is dangerous to be upon the storm-lashed sea without chart or compass. Life without fixed moral standards leaves humanity to be driven by every wind. The successful person is the one who possesses fixed ideas and whose life is controlled by moral limitations. Christianity is not a fragmentary, incoherent, heterogeneous mass of principles; it is a coherent, crystallized, splendid system of moral truths. The passage of the years adds to their luster, and no conditions with advantage can forget them and no civilization, however glorious it may be, can with honor supersede them. They are adapted for the high and the low, for all conditions and all circumstances.

And so the great principles of Democracy, those primal principles upon which individualism and true manhood rest, those great principles which are crystallized into tangible form in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of our country, are adapted to our conditions now and hereafter. They gave birth to the Republic; they nurtured it in its infancy and strengthened it in its youth; they have glorified it in its manhood and crowned it with ineffable splendor as the years have gone by. It is for these principles we should now contend; to their perpetuity our lives should be consecrated.

In proportion as they are observed the strength of this nation will be manifest. As we recede from them, from out the darkness will steal the spectral hand of decay and death to seize upon our country. It is an act of impiety, it is profanation to our sacred political truths, to disparage our Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and the primal principles of free Government as many now do. Men seek to commercialize our principles. If possible, they would coin the very principles themselves into dimes and dollars. The question, "Does it pay?" is more important to them than, "Is it right?" They ask the question, "Can we get an appropriation?" rather than, "What is constitutional?" The success of the President is measured by the patronage which he distributes, the offices which he creates, the commissions which he scatters, rather than the peace and liberty which he conserves and the constitutional government which he defends.

We have great principles and our country is founded upon great ideas. But ideas must be obeyed. "Civilizations are destroyed by great ideas, apprehended, but not lived up to." It is said that "Europe and America to-day are sick with the nightmare of their dreams. They have dreamed of democracy, and in their dreams have achieved liberty, but only in their dreams—not otherwise."

Mr. Chairman, I am not indicting our country or the principles that gave it birth. We are to differentiate between the individual and the system. If I am wrong in ascribing to the currents of the hour evils and disasters which will not come, I will be much happier in the rôle of a false prophet than a true one made so by my country's misfortunes.

I see ominous signs in the sky. The constitutional balances are disturbed. The Executive is growing in power far beyond the dreams of our fathers. It is becoming the accepted creed of the party in power that the Executive is superior to the Constitution; that he can operate beyond it and where its influences and restrictions do not go.

The halls of this Chamber are disturbed by the open and secret workings of those who "are carrying out the President's policy."

Not satisfied with usurped authority in the executive department, he invades the legislative. Congress has no will. It ceases to exist except as a vehicle to register the President's purposes and decrees.

Members of important committees cringe and fawn around the Executive Departments of the Government. They get their instructions there, not from the people. What measure has the Committee on Military Affairs submitted to the House which was not written in the War Office?

Members stand with bated breath in the presence of generals and adjutants and brass buttons and gold lace to learn what kind of an army we shall have and what the personnel shall be. No wonder that in important municipalities it is esteemed a greater honor to be elected a member of the municipal board than a Representative in Congress.

The President and the Army officers desire our military forces to be increased to 100,000 men. Forthwith the present members of Congress register the will of their masters. The President desires to operate in China without restraints or explanations, and thereupon Congress sits supinely by without venturing to inquire by what right the Executive engages in war in a foreign country, forms alliances with foreign powers which may involve this country in serious international complications, and pursues a policy

with respect to the important matters there arising, when the legislative branch of the Government has not spoken nor authorized him so to act.

The Executive declares war upon the Philippine republic, and Congress abjectly and cravenly applauds; it is not even asked to approve the unconstitutional course of the President.

The Executive determines to hold the Philippine Archipelago, and, without the authorization of Congress, by force attempts its conquest.

After governing by the military power for months and, indeed, years, he sends a commission to govern 10,000,000 of people.

To this commission absolute power is delegated. All executive, judicial, and legislative power is conferred upon them. They possess more despotic and arbitrary power than is held by any monarch on earth. To popularize these outrageous infractions of the organic law and this wide departure from the paths of peace and safety, commissions are distributed, offices are created and quickly filled, wealth is appealed to, social influences cultivated, and devious means are employed to break down the sober, conservative, peaceful spirit of the truly patriotic of the land.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that no one can witness the conduct of our country in the Philippine question without reaching the conclusion that our nation is launched upon the dangerous sea of imperialism.

Armies and navies and war and bloodshed—these are the themes of the hour.

The Federal Government is being immeasurably strengthened. The States, yielding to this increased power, which disarranges the system of our spheres, are less certain in their orbits and show a marked tendency to swing in smaller circles. Will they at last, like fiery orbs, be lost in the great central sun?

With centralization of power going on in the Federal Government there is being developed a more tyrannous one in the industrial world.

Civil and political liberty are threatened by the Republican party, and industrial liberty is being destroyed by the power of wealth.

Centralized power and aggregated wealth! These are the foes Democracy must challenge.

Post-Office Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH OF

HON. CLAUDE A. SWANSON,
OF VIRGINIA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 6, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13729) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902—

Mr. SWANSON said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not anticipate taking any part in the discussion of the pending question. It is a matter which has been before the House of Representatives ever since 1892, and we have the same speeches, the same discussion, the same figures, and the same arguments, and the same objections presented now that have been presented time and again in the memory of every member of this House in the past.

The best Democrat, I believe, who was ever produced, a man that we all loved and admired, a man the mention of whose name is held in reverence by every Democrat in the United States, used to lead the fight for us for this special mail facility, and that was Charles F. Crisp, of Georgia, once the Speaker of this House, a man whose Democracy was never questioned, whose justice, whose fairness, and whose sense of the propriety of such legislation has not been and never can be questioned, either here or elsewhere; one of the ablest men this section of the country has ever produced, a man who, in my judgment, was unequalled by any other man in this country in dealing with any constitutional or legal question before this body.

Now, this question, as I have said, has been before the House on many occasions heretofore. It was championed by Mr. Crisp. It received the indorsement of the leading Democrats upon this floor. There is no need, therefore, of going into spasms about the question. The first thing is, has the Government of the United States, as a Government, the function to carry the mails of the people? If not, then I admit that the argument against this appropriation is correct and that some other steps should be taken to provide for this necessary service. If it is not a governmental function to carry the mails either by a fast or slow train, then this appropriation should not appear in the bill.

Now, I am here, Mr. Chairman, to tell you that the people of the United States are dependent entirely on Congress for carrying the mails. We all recognize that fact. No private individual can enter into the business. If you destroy the mail facilities which are now afforded, if you refuse to appropriate money for the service, then you are denying to the people a privilege to which they are entitled. No citizen in my town or in Atlanta or in New Orleans, or in any of the great cities of the South, from New York down to the Gulf coast, can undertake the work or associate himself in a private enterprise, no matter what amount of money may be contributed, and no commercial body can undertake to supplement them in carrying the United States mails. It is exclusively a governmental function. We are entirely dependent upon the will of Congress as to whether we shall have fast or slow mails, or any mail at all, as far as that is concerned. Consequently, when a man talks of appropriations for this purpose, as in the nature of a subsidy he does not know the first word of common sense in the common language we all use.

I am here to tell you that if individuals could be permitted; if private enterprise could engage in this business, and if individuals could combine themselves together and contribute to form companies for carrying the mails, there would be no necessity on your part to appropriate a dollar for the service. It would all be done by the people themselves and at a profit. But Congress has assumed the entire responsibility. They claim that it is exclusively a governmental function.

If the people of the South are dependent upon the fast mail, they must depend upon Congress alone, because they can not obtain the service from any other source. And so I claim that in the enactment of the legislation proposed here it is simply the proper exercise of a governmental function. It comes down, then, practically to a business question. The pending bill appropriates \$173,000 for this special mail service. I wish every member of the House would listen to what I shall have to say in this connection. I want to present you the reasons why this appropriation should be made, which has been made ever since 1892, when Speaker Crisp championed it, and I hope I may have your attention while I explain the various steps through which the appropriation has passed, from time to time, from that date up to the present hour.

The sum of \$173,000 is appropriated to facilitate and expedite the fast mails from New York to New Orleans by way of Washington and Atlanta. The giving of these mail facilities is a governmental function. The only proposition for you to consider is, first, do you get good returns for the money expended? If you do not, if it is a gratuity, if no benefits are given, if the mail is not expedited, then I tell every man who is listening to me that it is an improper appropriation and you ought to vote against it. That is a fair argument, is it not? So, then, the first proposition for you to determine is, is the return received for the expenditure sufficient to justify the expenditure?

The next proposition is, are there enough people interested in it to justify this expenditure? The next proposition for you to consider is, can you get the expedition and speed unless you make this appropriation? Now, I say, if I can not sustain each one of these three propositions, then it is your duty as members of Congress to vote against this appropriation and refuse to pass it. That is a fair argument from a business standpoint, is it not? The carrying of the mails is a governmental function. The people are dependent upon you for a fast mail.

Now, the first question for you to answer is, What facilities do the people of the South get for this special appropriation? Let us see. The best test is what were the mail facilities before the appropriation was made, and what have the facilities been since it was made? One gentleman has said that there was a gradual increase. I will admit that if the argument of the gentleman who has spoken against this appropriation is true, if there has been only a gradual increase for ten years, that is a matter for you to consider; but I want to show you that in March, 1892, after Congress had voted the appropriation, then, like lightning descending from heaven, all of a sudden, there was a change in the mail facilities of the South nine years ago.

I challenge any gentleman who has spoken against this appropriation to deny that before it was made there was only one through mail from New York to New Orleans, but once a day, and that was by the train known as No. 37. The great business community from New York to New Orleans had but one through mail a day. All trade, all commerce, all business had to be conducted by that one train. Now, this is not what I say about it. If a man contradicts it, I will show him the letter and the evidence of Mr. Shallenberger, Second Assistant Postmaster-General. He tells us that now there are two through services—one by train 35 and the other by train 37—between New York and New Orleans, whereas before the appropriation there was but one through connection between those points.

This small sum of \$173,000 was appropriated, and immediately there were two through trains from New York to New Orleans,

whereas before the appropriation you had but one. Now, consider the number of people interested—5,000,000 people in the great State of New York, all the New England mail, all the people of the States of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina—and you will find that the mail of 10,000,000 people was expedited by having two through trains. This increase in facilities did not come gradually or slowly, but in March, 1893, at the very minute when this appropriation became available.

Now, let me give you the difference between the mails delivered in the towns. I do not want a man to vote for this appropriation unless he believes some benefits come to the people and not to the railroads. I am not here to speak for the railroads. I am not here trying to give them a gratuity. If there is a man in this House who does not believe that the mail of these people has been facilitated and expedited by this appropriation, it is that man's duty as a Representative in this body to vote against it. But here are the facts and here is the evidence. Here is the letter of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General giving the running of trains before and after this appropriation was made. And as I say, the change was a sudden one, not gradual.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. SWANSON. This letter is dated 1893, and gives exactly the running time between New York and all these various places, before this appropriation was made, and after.

OFFICE OF THE SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., March 3, 1893.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge your favor of the 26th ultimo, making inquiry as to the employment of the "special facilities" appropriation for the transmission of the mails between New York, N. Y., and New Orleans, La., via Washington, D. C., by the system of railway postal-car service operated over the Southern Railway Company between the points mentioned in your letter of date above quoted, and in reply thereto I herewith furnish the information requested in the order of your inquiry, viz:

First. I would like to have a statement of the number of trains carrying mail on February 1, 1893, and their time of departure from New York and Washington for points between Washington and the South and Southwest over the Southern Railway, as compared with the same information on February 1, 1893. I desire to ascertain the number of hours consumed in the transmission of mail on each train between New York and Washington and the following points on the two dates above mentioned: Danville, Greensboro, Charlotte, Atlanta, Montgomery, Mobile, New Orleans, Houston, San Antonio, Birmingham, Memphis, Columbia, Augusta, Savannah, Jacksonville, Tampa, Asheville, Knoxville, and Chattanooga.

First. On February 1, 1893, there were two trains operating between Washington, D. C., and New Orleans, La., for the dispatch of mails between the points named and for the intermediate destinations mentioned by you. The time in transit, stated in hours and minutes, figured from New York to destination, is shown to have been as below stated. It will be noticed, however, that the morning train did not have a connection through to New Orleans, but was abandoned at Atlanta, Ga., the connection being taken up by the following train, which was due to leave New York at 4.30 p. m. The side connections, however, for Chattanooga, Augusta, Savannah, and Jacksonville, etc., were made by this morning train from New York, but there was no through direct connection for destinations south of Atlanta, Ga., including New Orleans and connecting points. The schedule was as follows:

	Train No. 9.	Train No. 35.	Train No. 11.
<i>Leave.</i>			
New York	12.15 a. m.	4.30 p. m.	4.30 p. m.
Washington	8.30 a. m.	10.45 p. m.	11 p. m.
<i>Arrive.</i>			
Danville	18.15 hours	13 hours	15.15 hours.
Greensboro	19.55 hours	14.25 hours	17 hours.
Charlotte	22.55 hours	16.55 hours	20.20 hours.
Atlanta	33 hours	24.25 hours	30.30 hours.
Montgomery	39 hours	29 hours	38.35 hours.
Mobile	No connection for these points by this train.	34.45 hours	44 hours.
New Orleans		39.05 hours	48.15 hours.
Houston		55.37 hours	62.37 hours.
San Antonio		63.30 hours	75.45 hours.
Asheville		23.55 hours	
Knoxville	28 hours	22.05 hours	
Chattanooga	31.45 hours	25.20 hours	
Birmingham	37.55 hours	31.35 hours	
Memphis	43.45 hours	38.30 hours	
Columbia	29.45 hours	20.50 hours	
Augusta	33.45 hours	23.55 hours	
Savannah	35.30 hours	24.40 hours	
Jacksonville	43.40 hours	39.25 hours	
Tampa	55.35 hours	48.25 hours	

The hours in transit in the foregoing table are figured from the time of departure from New York. It will be noted that the a. m. dispatch from New York and Washington did not connect for points in the direction of Montgomery and New Orleans, but did connect for other destinations mentioned in your letter. As will be seen, train 35, leaving New York at 4.30 p. m., was the only through and complete dispatch for all the offices enumerated by you. Train No. 11, due to leave Washington at 11 p. m., was a slow train, having a through connection for New Orleans and points beyond, but having no connections for the intermediate offices and sections to which reference is made by your letter.

This train was doubtless put on by the railroad company to relieve the 10.45 p. m. train of local business, thereby enabling train 35 to make much faster time. You will notice that both trains take up the 4.30 p. m. connection from New York, and that train 11 was due to leave Washington only seventeen minutes after train 35, but that train 11 did not reach New Orleans

for nine hours and ten minutes after the preceding train, which left Washington only seventeen minutes earlier.

The foregoing schedule and explanation shows the condition of the service between New York and New Orleans on February 1, 1893, as you desire, and I will now detail the present service between the same points, to complete the information called for in the first paragraph of your inquiry.

The present service as operated under the "special facilities" appropriation is as follows:

	Train No. 35.	Train No. 37.
<i>Leave.</i>		
New York	4.30 a. m.	4.30 p. m.
Washington	11.15 a. m.	10.45 p. m.
<i>Arrive.</i>		
Danville	13.25 hours	13.10 hours.
Greensboro	15.02 hours	14.35 hours.
Charlotte	17.30 hours	16.55 hours.
Atlanta	23.40 hours	24.25 hours.
Montgomery	28.30 hours	28.50 hours.
Mobile	33.15 hours	34.35 hours.
New Orleans	39.40 hours	39.10 hours.
Houston	52.25 hours	54 hours.
San Antonio	59.55 hours	62.55 hours.
Asheville	19.42 hours	21.55 hours.
Knoxville	23.30 hours	25.15 hours.
Chattanooga	27.25 hours	29.35 hours.
Birmingham	32.20 hours	38.40 hours.
Memphis	38.40 hours	39.20 hours.
Columbia	21.07 hours	24.45 hours.
Augusta	27.15 hours	28.05 hours.
Savannah	24.50 hours	28.55 hours.
Jacksonville	28.45 hours	31.55 hours.
Tampa	40.40 hours	41.55 hours.

From the above it will be noticed that there are two through direct services by trains 35 and 37 between New York, N. Y., and the destinations mentioned. There was no through connection for New Orleans, La., for mails dispatched from New York and Washington in the morning under the old schedule of trains, the through service being practically but once daily, as the morning dispatch from New York and Washington, being by a slow train, was overtaken en route by the train leaving New York at 4.30 p. m., so that for all practical purposes of through service to New Orleans and beyond the 4.30 p. m. was the only train. A comparison of the figures indicating transit time by trains 35 and 37 with trains 9 and 37 of the 1893 schedule will show at a glance the great improvement which has been secured through the adoption of the present schedule by train 35. In fine, the service by train 35 is an entirely new and improved train, which was not operated in any sense in 1893.

"Second. Since the establishment of the fast-mail service, beginning July 1, 1893, have the schedules of diverging lines from junctional points with the main line between Washington and New Orleans been changed to conform to the schedules of the fast-mail trains in order to expedite the delivery of the mails to the interior of the Southern States?"

Second. The schedules of lines connecting the Washington and New Orleans railway post-office system have very generally been made to conform to the latter, so that all important lateral connections are made for the interior of the Southern States.

"Third. Have the roads receiving this extra compensation reduced the running time of their trains between the main points by doing away with the local stops for passengers? If so, how have such roads provided for the local business? Have they put on additional trains for this purpose?"

Third. It is not possible to say exactly how far the schedule of the Washington and New Orleans railway post-office has been expedited by cutting out the local stops, etc., but by reason of the fact that a third train is operated the whole distance from Washington to New Orleans, which was not the case in 1893, it is fair to conclude that local passenger traffic is provided for by the third train, thereby relieving the principal mail trains of the local stops.

"Fourth. Did the Southern Railway Company, or rather at that time the Richmond and Danville Railroad Company, operate a train from Washington on February 1, 1893, to points in the South, after the arrival of the fast mail which left New York at 4.30 a. m.? If not, do they now operate such a train; and if so, does its operation expedite the delivery of the mails from New England as well as western New York and Pennsylvania to Southern and Southwestern points?"

Fourth. There was no train operated on the Washington and New Orleans route in February, 1893, which took up the connection at Washington from the New York and Washington "fast-mail" railway post-office leaving New York at 4.30 a. m. Train 35, hereinbefore described, however, does make the connection referred to, and it is a fact beyond question that the mails are very greatly expedited thereby, as the figures showing transit time by train 9 in 1893 compared with the present train 35 fully indicate. The mails affected are those from New England, New York State, and Pennsylvania for the Southern and Southwestern destinations.

"Fifth. To what extent does the Post-Office Department assume control over the schedules of the Southern Railway Company and connecting lines on the through mail trains on account of the payment of this extra compensation? In other words, can the railway companies change the departing and arriving time of such trains without the consent of the Post-Office Department?"

Fifth. Railroad companies receiving extra compensation out of the "Special facilities" appropriation are required to furnish a schedule satisfactory to the Department, and the arriving and departing time so fixed can not be changed except by consent of the Department.

"Sixth. Does the Department, in awarding this special appropriation to the companies, stipulate in the award the number of trains that shall be run daily? If so, how many?"

Sixth. In the application of the appropriation for "Special facilities" in the transmission of the mails the Department stipulates the train or trains which it is intended shall be operated, but generally the stipulation is confined to the train moving in the direction most urgently needed, with a companion return train. The latter, however, is not, as a rule, required to be a specially high-speed train. The postal needs in each case differ more or less, and hence there is no general rule, so to speak.

"Seventh. In your opinion, has not the mail service between Washington and Atlanta and New Orleans and other Southern and Southwestern points been very materially improved and the delivery quickened since the passage of the act in March, 1893, making the appropriation for necessary and special facilities?"

Seventh. I am clearly of the opinion that the service between Washington,

D. C., Atlanta, Ga., and New Orleans, La., and other Southern and Southwestern territory has been very materially improved and the delivery of the mails expedited since March, 1893.

Very respectfully,

W. S. SHALLENBERGER,
Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

Hon. CLAUDE A. SWANSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. SWANSON. With pleasure.

Mr. GAINES. The Department states, through Mr. Shallenberger, on page 452, that train 37 is not a subsidized train.

Mr. SWANSON. I say it is not. I am not speaking about that. If you will listen to me for five minutes, you will find that I am talking about train 35.

Mr. GAINES. I thought you said both these trains were subsidized.

Mr. SWANSON. Not at all. I said that before this appropriation was made there was but one train, and that was train 37. As soon as the appropriation was made they had two trains, the new train being No. 35.

Mr. GAINES. And train 37 makes the trip fifteen minutes sooner than the other one.

Mr. SWANSON. I am not talking about that. I say they have two trains a day now, whereas before they had only one; and the gentleman must admit that.

Mr. GAINES. But the one that is subsidized only gets to New Orleans fifteen minutes quicker than the unsubsidized train.

Mr. SWANSON. But there are two mails a day. Train 37 ran only once a day. I am not comparing the speed of the trains; because, as you will see a little later, there is a reason for that. You have the commerce, trade, and business of the people of nine States facilitated to-day; and yet you stand here and say that the people of the South should have only one through mail from New York to New Orleans, and that is train 37, once a day. I am here to tell you that train 37 has always run, but that train 35 is the new train, and that is the only train that gets this special-facility appropriation.

Mr. GAINES. But how is it that it does not run faster than the other?

Mr. SWANSON. I will tell you why, if you want to know. Under the rules of the Department the schedule of that train is fixed by the Postmaster-General. He fixes the time it leaves Washington; he fixes the time it leaves Danville; he fixes the time it leaves Greensboro; he fixes the time it leaves Atlanta. That train must wait from Washington to New Orleans to make mail connections, and not for passengers. If it is necessary to wait two hours in Washington, it waits for all train mail going south. Passengers may take other trains and go on from Washington to New Orleans.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Do they run twelve hours apart?

Mr. SWANSON. One leaves Washington at 10 o'clock at night and the other leaves at 11 o'clock in the morning—about twelve hours apart. Now, that is the proposition. Now, let us look at it further. You never had two through trains, and could not have them carry the mails through from New York to New Orleans before this appropriation was made. Now, what is this train required to do? Let us see. There is not another train in the United States required to do this. Its schedule is submitted to the Department.

The Department wants that mail-facility train for mail and not for passengers. It is required to leave at 4 o'clock in the morning. Suppose you are in New York and want to go to New Orleans. You would not take that train, but you would take the 8 o'clock train in the morning. As the chairman of this committee has well said, the Atlantic Coast Line used to have this contract. It did not go as far as New Orleans, but went to Jacksonville. That train was required to leave New York at 4 o'clock in the morning. They said they lost more by passengers than they made on the mail, and they gave it up voluntarily, as the gentleman from California has well said.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. SWANSON. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Did not the Second Assistant Postmaster-General state in his testimony that it has not retarded the delivery of the mail in the community?

Mr. SWANSON. I will tell you what he said. I will answer every question, and I invite interruption. Now, let us see. The Atlantic Coast Line had this contract. Let us look at this as a business proposition. They had to get their train out of New York at 4 o'clock in the morning to make this connection in the South. They said they lost more on the passengers than all of this appropriation, and they gave it up.

As the chairman of the committee [Mr. LOUD] has well said, for about six months they went about in the clouds. The mail facilities of the South were demoralized, and chambers of com-

merce came and asked them to give the facilities they had. Now, this appropriation is not made to any one railroad. Gentlemen have tried to mislead the House here. There are three lines that can get this contract if they will speed it. The Atlantic Coast Line, the Seaboard Air Line, and the Southern Railway, and any one of them that will make the best time and the best speed can get it.

Mr. GAINES. You said there was only one train to carry the mail, and now you have found three in five minutes.

Mr. SWANSON. Only one for the six months when the mail service became demoralized when the Atlantic Coast Line gave up the contract.

Mr. GAINES. But there were three trains all the time.

Mr. SWANSON. They have had three lines, but not three mail trains. You can not make the distinction between a train that carries passengers and those that carry the mail and passengers. Every train is not a mail train. You have an idea that every train that starts out is a mail train.

Mr. GAINES. The Atlantic Coast Line had the subsidy and did not they give it up, and did not they continue their trains as they did before?

Mr. SWANSON. Their trains were changed from 4 o'clock to 8 o'clock. Eight o'clock in the morning is not a time you want to get the mail. This train was intended to be a train to get the mail that accumulated in New York between 7 o'clock in the evening and 4 o'clock in the morning. They have uniformly refused to pay it to any train that did not get out at 4 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. GAINES. Train 37 takes the New England mail from New York?

Mr. SWANSON. It leaves about 5.30 o'clock in the evening, and gets here about 10.30 and goes south.

Mr. GAINES. They report that train 37 takes the New England mail.

Mr. SWANSON. You have got the whole thing reversed.

Mr. GAINES. I will get it and read it to the gentleman.

Mr. SWANSON. Get it and read it. The Postmaster-General said that if train 35 was changed, if they were to hold it for the New England mail, the whole mail of the South would be demoralized. Now, I tell you they are required to make a certain schedule, and if they do not get into Danville by a certain time they do not pay them, and if they do not get to New Orleans in a certain time, and do not make the connection there, they do not pay them. If they fail to make the connection to carry the mail, they do not get the pay.

Mr. GRIGGS. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. SWANSON. Certainly.

Mr. GRIGGS. The Second Assistant Postmaster-General, a few days ago, stated to me that last year this railroad had had deducted \$27,000 for failure to make the proper connection.

Mr. SWANSON. Twenty-seven thousand dollars. That is nearly all that the Southern road gets.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Are they the only roads that are fined?

Mr. SWANSON. I do not know about that; but let us go further as a business proposition.

Mr. GAINES. Will my friend allow me an interruption?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes.

Mr. GAINES. The gentleman said that if No. 35 was taken off 37 would not catch the mail. I want to read from the Hearings, Part I, page 451:

This 3.30 train could, of course, take the bulk of the New York mail forwarded on train 37, and its running time is forty-five minutes less. It would, however, miss all the New England mail which leaves Boston at 8.30 a. m., reaching New York at 3.30 p. m., in time to catch train 37.

Now, that is what Mr. Shallenberger and Mr. Grant say. Train 37 is a nonsubsidized train and gets to New Orleans in the same time that the subsidized train does, lacking fifteen minutes.

Mr. GRIGGS. Will the gentleman permit me? Is not train 37 the Washington Southwestern vestibuled train which leaves at 10.47 at night?

Mr. GAINES. I do not know.

Mr. GRIGGS. If it be true that the mail would catch that train, would it not make it twelve hours later?

Mr. GAINES. I do not know. The gentleman said that train 35 would destroy the New England connection, and I wanted to read what Mr. Shallenberger said in reference to it.

Mr. GRIGGS. If my friend from Virginia will permit me a moment, I do not want to take up the time of the House, but I want to say that all the trains south from Atlanta running down into the southwestern part of the State to the coast are run with reference to the local schedule and the local passenger traffic and local mail matter, and if train 35 were to be delayed three hours in its arrival time at Atlanta the mail going to the southwestern part of the State, in the districts represented by Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BRADLEY, and myself, and in the northern part of the State, in the districts represented by Mr. MADDOX and Mr. TATE, the mail would be delayed twelve hours.

Mr. GAINES. But would it be delayed any more if the train was not subsidized?

Mr. GRIGGS. Well, these gentlemen say that the train will be taken off. I do not know whether it will or not.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Shallenberger says if it was, he could get other facilities, and then train 37 would be on. There are three other roads running from New York.

Mr. SWANSON. Now, the gentlemen from Tennessee has put these statements into everybody's speech who has spoken.

Mr. GAINES. Well, they are true and right.

Mr. SWANSON. Yes, but the gentleman from Tennessee has not all the sense or judgment there is in this House. I have as much right to have my views as the gentleman has to have his; and I am discussing this as a business proposition.

Mr. GAINES. I have treated the gentleman from Virginia courteously, and I proposed to be treated courteously.

Mr. SWANSON. Well, the gentleman from Tennessee can put all this in in his own time.

Mr. GAINES. You can strike out all I have put into your speech, although you yielded to me.

Mr. SWANSON. Now, I have made a statement which can not be denied, and I want to read it so that the House can understand it, showing that there is twelve hours difference between the two trains, and before the appropriation was made there was but one new train between New York and New Orleans.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Before the gentleman leaves that proposition I want to ask him a question.

Mr. SWANSON. Very well.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. I have no doubt the gentleman will be able to demonstrate that the mail facilities between New York and New Orleans are better now than they were ten years ago, and he attributes that improvement to the subsidy alone. Now, are there not other lines where the mail facilities between other great cities have been greatly improved in the last ten years without a subsidy?

Mr. SWANSON. I will answer that in this way. The improvement in other lines has been gradual, gradually increasing for ten years, but this commenced the very month the appropriation was made, ten years ago.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Are they no better at this time than they were then?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes; it has been increased by their putting on other connections, but there was a sudden change the month that the appropriation was made, and I would like for any man to ascribe it to any other reason.

Now, take the town of Danville, on train No. 9, subsidized, and train No. 5. The Postmaster-General said it used to take, on train No. 9, 18 hours and 15 minutes for a letter to get to New York, and the very month after it took only 13 hours, a gain of 5 hours; to Greensboro, 19 hours and 53 minutes before, and after this appropriation it immediately changed to 14 hours and 25 minutes; Charlotte, before, 22 hours and 55 minutes, and after the appropriation 16 hours and 55 minutes; Atlanta, 33 hours before and 24 hours after the appropriation. There Atlanta gained 8 hours in postal facilities to New York. I could take it all down through and show you that it was not a gradual increase, but it was an increase which commenced with this appropriation.

Now, is not that enough to justify this appropriation? There is no doubt about the facilities having been increased. That is admitted on all hands.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. They have been increased all over the country.

Mr. SWANSON. But the question is whether they would have been increased without this appropriation. I say frankly that if you can get this mail service without paying this money you ought to do it. If you can get the mail five hours earlier at Danville, eight hours earlier at Atlanta, and correspondingly early at New Orleans and other Southern points without spending this money, you ought not spend it. So that the question is simply whether you can get this service without this appropriation.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. We can never know that until we try.

Mr. SWANSON. This appropriation leaves the matter entirely to the discretion of the Postmaster-General. It is not a specific and absolute appropriation. The appropriation says that if the Postmaster-General needs this money in order to facilitate mail service he shall spend it. If he does not need it, he ought not to spend it under the terms of the appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Is it fair to say in this case that the expenditure of the appropriation is practically at the discretion of the Postmaster-General when the appropriation is made against his will and contrary to his recommendation?

Mr. SWANSON. Let me discuss the proposition as to this appropriation being against the will of the Postmaster-General. That officer says he believes it would be better, in view of conditions all over the country in general, not to have this appropriation.

He has never said anywhere that the appropriation did not facilitate the transportation of the mail from New York to New Orleans. His own letter and his own evidence say that it does facilitate the mails. It is true, he says also, that there are complaints from other sections that they do not get the same facilities that people get down South, and that in general it would be best not to make such appropriations.

Now, let us see whether the Postmaster-General has exercised this discretion or not. I say that he has. Formerly \$25,000 of this appropriation was expended upon a train from Boston to New York. For some years that appropriation has not been so used. Why? The Postmaster-General says that the Department did not expend the appropriation upon that railroad because the train running from Boston to New York would not make a schedule satisfactory to the Department. This appropriation formerly amounted to \$190,000; but for years \$25,000 of the appropriation—and I am now showing that the Postmaster-General has exercised discretion in this matter—\$25,000 of this appropriation was not expended upon a road which, if it had complied with the terms of the Department, would have been entitled to receive this money.

Why was it withheld? Because the road would not give the special facilities which the Department required. When that road refused to furnish the schedule which would have entitled it to this \$25,000, the Kansas and Newton road immediately offered, in consideration of this allowance of \$25,000, to supply a train which would meet the demands of the Department. In this respect, too, the Department exercised its discretion. As I have already said, if the Department is satisfied that these special facilities on this Southern route can be supplied without the expenditure of this appropriation, the Department ought not to expend it. The Department wants Congress to take the responsibility. Suppose Congress should refuse to appropriate this sum, and suppose the transportation of the mails should go back to what it formerly was. Suppose we should have simply one through train from New York to New Orleans.

Mr. GILBERT. Would that occur, in your judgment, if the subsidy were withdrawn?

Mr. SWANSON. All I can answer is that the railroads so say. I can not answer on my own knowledge. I have not been able to get the information. But the Department can test this question next year if the Department wants to take the responsibility of a test. It knows the facts; it knows better than we do the parties that it has to deal with. I am willing that the Department should make this test next year. Let the Department refuse to pay these roads, and then see whether it obtains the service or not. If the Department refuses to make the expenditure, and in consequence the trains are not run in such a way as to accommodate the public, that will be a test of this question. All I say is that this is a question that Congress can not determine. The Department tells us that it is a matter of conjecture.

The men of the South living along the line where these special facilities are afforded are willing that the Department shall take the responsibility of determining by such a test as I describe whether we can get this service without the appropriation. If I were Postmaster-General and could get these mail facilities without specially paying for them, I would not so pay. Let the Postmaster-General take the responsibility. You give him similar discretion in other matters. He knows more about this question than we do. But if this appropriation is defeated here, and if thereby our mail facilities are lessened; if in consequence of the withdrawal of this appropriation we have but one through mail a day to my town and to Atlanta and to other Southern points now accommodated by these facilities; if eight or ten millions of people who receive their mail along this line find their business incommoded by the withdrawal of this appropriation, then I could not justify myself with my people if I had failed to advocate the continuance of the appropriation.

If he is opposed to it, if gentlemen think the language of discretion should be broader, if it is not now broad enough, if the responsibility is not put upon the Department, then let them suggest language which will be broader, and which will cover the suggestions they are pleased to make.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Will my friend yield to me for a moment in this connection?

Mr. SWANSON. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I see in the Richmond Dispatch of this morning an editorial bearing directly upon this subject, from which I quote:

How much longer is Richmond to suffer because of the discrimination against her in the matter of mail-train schedules?

Mr. SWANSON. I understand what the gentleman is talking about. I know very well, because I have seen the article to which he alludes.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Let me finish, in a word.

Mr. SWANSON. I am aware of what the gentleman is going to say.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. The Despatch informs us in this editorial that the mail service between there and Danville is "a little better" with respect to mail facilities than it was "in the days of the old stagecoaches."

Mr. SWANSON. I understand perfectly. But the gentleman is entirely mistaken. This matter does not interest Richmond specially. Richmond is not in the line of this special-facility service. The mail goes out on the Virginia Midland; and I will say that most of the opposition in Virginia to the service comes from the gentlemen who do not know the line or what the facilities are which it affords.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. This is from the Richmond Despatch, and I suppose that Richmond, the capital city of the State, ought to know something about it.

Mr. SWANSON. Undoubtedly. But Richmond is not on the line of this special-facility service. This is a through line from New York to New Orleans, and the gentleman from the first district knows it as well as I do. He knows that this provision is not for the purpose of facilitating the mails to Richmond. That is entirely disconnected from the service between New York and New Orleans. The service to Richmond comes from the Atlantic Coast Line. That line gave this subsidy up some years ago for their own reasons.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I understand my colleague to say that Richmond is not at all improved or benefited by this service. Now, if the capital city of the State is not benefited by it, then who does get the benefit in the State of Virginia?

Mr. SWANSON. I do not mean to be understood as saying that Richmond does not get some benefit from this fast mail. And I do not want to make any misrepresentation in reference to the matter. I want to be entirely frank in my statements, and I am glad to enlighten the gentleman on this proposition, or any other proposition connected with this appropriation. I have looked into the matter very closely; I have endeavored to study all the details of it.

Mr. SIMS. I want to see if I understand the gentleman properly, and ask him to yield to me for a question.

Mr. SWANSON. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. Because I want to vote intelligently when this matter is before the House. Is it the contention of the gentleman from Virginia that by reason of this extra appropriation you get better service than we get generally throughout the South?

Mr. SWANSON. Here is what I say, if the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. SIMS. Is that your contention?

Mr. SWANSON. I say that this line has long enjoyed the special mail facilities. The people have become accustomed to it. The gentleman is aware of that fact. Now, if there is a line that does not get special mail facilities, or if there are any people throughout the country who want better mail facilities than they have, I certainly should not be willing to deny them the privilege. I would vote for any reasonable appropriation that would extend mail facilities to all of our people. I am here to say that the people are entitled to get the very best mail facilities that the Government can afford.

Mr. SIMS. Is it not a fact that the mail facilities on these subsidized lines to which the gentleman refers are better on that account than they are generally throughout the South?

Mr. SWANSON. I should imagine that they were better on this line.

Mr. SIMS. Then, would the gentleman wish to vote for a special favoritism to this section not enjoyed by any other?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, I am here to say that when you take the great commercial centers of New York and New Orleans, and from which mail is distributed to every other important city and to all hamlets and towns in the United States, that I would not be willing, under any circumstances, to hamper or impair the transportation of such mails. And I am willing to expedite the mails and to give equal facilities to all parts of the country connected with them. But I am here to say that I would not vote for this proposition unless it was requested distinctly by the Postmaster-General. This is a matter which has been carefully considered by the Department, which is best calculated to deal with the wants of this service. I would not vote for it unless it was made discretionary with the Postmaster-General. There are many considerations which we must look into—

Mr. GROSVENOR. I beg to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. SWANSON. Certainly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would like to ask a question as to the gentleman's contention in regard to this facilitated mail and his argument in favor of continuing this appropriation. I understand the gentleman's argument to be that the faster the mail is carried, in the same vehicle, on the same trip, that therefore the higher ought to be the pay to the carrier. In other words, that the faster the mail is carried, the higher the pay should be. Is that the contention?

Mr. SWANSON. No; not exactly. To some extent I will say that this would justify an increase of compensation. But I do say that wherever a train is run absolutely in the interest of the Government, and the Government fixes the schedule and takes the privilege of making it to facilitate the mail transportation, not the passenger service—in other words, when the passenger service is made subsidiary to the mail service—when this is done throughout this great section of the country, that the mail is run for the benefit of the people, and that there should be just and adequate appropriations from Congress to compensate for the expense incurred by the railroads in conducting that service.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But you would not justify the Postmaster-General in giving this extra pay to a train that was run at the rate of 20 miles an hour, when upon a rival track there was a train running 40 miles an hour from New York to New Orleans?

Mr. SWANSON. If it accommodated the same class of people, made the same connections, and was equally efficient in the distribution of the mail, I would say no.

Mr. GROSVENOR. How could it?

Mr. SWANSON. I say it could not.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is what I wanted to know. Then speed, I say, is the real question.

Mr. RHEA of Kentucky. I understood the gentleman from Virginia to say that if any mail line now was not enjoying the benefit of the subsidy, and if the mails would be expedited by a subsidy, he would vote for that. Then do I understand the gentleman to say that he is ready to vote for any subsidy presented to the House?

Mr. SWANSON. I have made no such proposition and have made no statement which would permit of any such construction.

Mr. RHEA of Kentucky. I will refer to the Official Reporter's notes to see if you did not say substantially that.

Mr. SWANSON. I say that the carrying of the mail is a governmental function, and if there are people in any section of the country who have not mail facilities which are requisite to accommodate their business, trade, and commerce I will vote for giving them new mail facilities.

Mr. RHEA of Kentucky. Now, will the gentleman from Virginia tell me the difference in principle between a subsidy to the railroads for carrying the mails and a subsidy to ships for carrying commerce?

Mr. SWANSON. I will tell you why. Commerce is a private business.

Mr. RHEA of Kentucky. Oh!

Mr. SWANSON. Commerce is engaged in by private individuals. No one is prohibited from engaging in it. But no private individual can carry the mail. The minute a private individual tries to carry the mail the Government will fine him and put him in prison. Since the Government has monopolized the carrying of the mails and private individuals can not engage in that business, there is an obligation on the Government to give every citizen in the United States good and rapid mail facilities, and I will vote for that.

Mr. RHEA of Kentucky. Now, does not the gentleman know that railroad corporations are quasi-public corporations, and that the Government can compel them to carry the mails whether they wish to or not?

Mr. SWANSON. The Government under the general law makes no special contract with railroads providing that the mail shall be carried at certain rates of speed. The schedules of trains are not fixed. The connections which they shall make and the hour and minute at which they shall leave and arrive are not determined. The railroads simply put on a postal car, which goes on the passenger train, and the passenger train is run at such times and at such speed as suits the convenience of the railroad company. The mail is carried subsidiary to the passenger business. This is the only train in the United States, except the one between Kansas City and Newton, where the carrying of passengers is subordinated to the carrying of the mail by special agreement with the Government.

Mr. RHEA of Kentucky. The gentleman, of course, does not wish to evade; but I fear he misapprehended the question. The question I asked was if the gentleman did not know that railroad corporations are quasi public corporations, and that this Government has the right to compel them to carry the mails without having to beg them to do so.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not know to what extent you can or can not compel them. Certainly the Government can not compel a railroad company to run its trains faster than it otherwise would or to hold its trains for the purpose of making connections with other trains without paying something for the special accommodation.

I say if you ran a wagon between the town of A and the town of B, if you were an humble wagoner, you would not give the Government power to fix the time when the wagon should leave the town of A and arrive at the town of B, or to say that the wagon

should not carry passengers, or take absolute control of it, without requiring the Government to give you something for surrendering your rights in the matter.

Mr. RHEA of Kentucky. I repeat that of course the gentleman from Virginia does not want to evade, but he still does not understand the question. The wagoner does not ask for any special charter to drive his wagon over the public road, but a railroad must have a charter before it can run.

Mr. SWANSON. It gets its charter from the State.

Mr. RHEA of Kentucky. All railroads are under governmental control, either State or national.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not know one of these railroads that has a charter from the Federal Government. Of course the Southern and Union Pacific have charters from the Federal Government, but not the roads in this system. Now, I want to say in this matter that if any man thinks that they ought not to get this, he can take the responsibility of voting against it. That is all right. I want to say that I have been on the Post-Office Committee, and I would not vote for this appropriation unless it was left discretionary with the Post-Office Department.

I say it is the duty of the Postmaster-General, if he thinks that he can get as good mail facilities without this, to cut off this appropriation for one year and test it. But I am not willing, in my town nor for my section, to take the responsibility of withholding this appropriation and take the responsibility off the Post-Office, and then wake up and find my mails are like they used to be.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Does the gentleman think it will help the Postmaster-General secure these additional facilities to make this facility at his discretion?

Mr. SWANSON. He cut it off from New York to Boston because they got no special facilities.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Will not the fact of making this appropriation interfere with his discretion in the matter?

Mr. SWANSON. The Postmaster-General has not to make an offer to any line now. It is left entirely discretionary with him, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] said; he can either give it or not. It is a question of asking the Department to take the risk or asking you to take the risk, and you will see whether your mails will not be eight or ten hours later, and have the mails demoralized. The discretion is left with the Postmaster-General to exercise.

Railway Mail Pay.

SPEECH

OF

HON. MARION BUTLER,

OF NORTH CAROLINA.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Monday, February 18, and Wednesday, February 20, 1901.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13729) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902—

Mr. BUTLER said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I offer an amendment to come in on page 17, line 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEVERIDGE in the chair). The Senator from North Carolina offers an amendment, which will be stated:

The SECRETARY. On page 17, line 2, strike out the words "thirty-four million seven hundred thousand dollars," and insert in lieu thereof—

"thirty-two million dollars; and the Postmaster-General is hereby authorized and directed to readjust the compensation to be paid from and after the 1st day of July, 1901, for the transportation of mails on railway routes by reducing the compensation to all railroad companies for the transportation of mails 5 per cent per annum from the rate fixed in section 4002 of the Revised Statutes as amended by the act of July 12, 1876, and as further amended by the act of June 17, 1878, for the transportation of mails on the basis of the average weight; and also to further reduce such compensation on weights in excess of 5,000 pounds daily per mile of line in accordance with the following schedule:

"One per cent on roads now receiving from 16.50 cents to 20 cents per ton per mile; 2 per cent on roads now receiving from 14 cents to 16.50 cents per ton per mile; 3 per cent on roads now receiving from 12.50 cents to 14 cents per ton per mile; 4 per cent on roads now receiving from 11.25 cents to 12.50 cents per ton per mile; 5 per cent on roads now receiving from 10 cents to 11.25 cents per ton per mile; 6 per cent on roads now receiving from 9.20 cents to 10 cents per ton per mile; 7 per cent on roads now receiving from 8.80 cents to 9.20 cents per ton per mile; 8 per cent on roads now receiving from 8.40 cents to 8.80 cents per ton per mile; 9 per cent on roads now receiving from 8.10 cents to 8.40 cents per ton per mile; 10 per cent on roads now receiving from 7.67 cents to 8.10 cents per ton per mile; 11 per cent on roads now receiving from 7.34 cents to 7.67 cents per ton per mile; 12 per cent on

roads now receiving from 7 cents to 7.34 cents per ton per mile, and the above amount appropriated shall cover full compensation for railway mail transportation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, that amendment and its phraseology may sound complicated to Senators who have not taken the trouble to read the testimony taken by the postal commission, but for the information of Senators I will state that schedule is exactly the schedule worked out and recommended to the postal commission by Professor Adams, the expert of the Interstate Commerce Commission, who was employed by the postal commission to assist them in arriving at a conclusion. Professor Adams, I think I would be justified in saying, is looked upon as a man not hostile to corporations, but rather friendly to them. I think, while he is a man of great ability and high character, that, when he was selected by the postal commission as an expert to assist them, those who were familiar with this matter realized that if he was biased in any way he was biased in favor of the railroads, and that whether intentionally or not his surroundings and trainings and sympathies would cause him to make his recommendations as favorable as possible to corporations; that is, that he would be inclined to give all possible weight to the testimony that would show that we are not paying too much for carrying the mail, and would never be inclined to give too much weight to testimony that tended to show that we were paying an exorbitant price.

I think I state the fact, and if I do not I hope to be corrected by some member of the commission—several members of which are members of this body—when I state that he was not employed by the commission until the testimony piled up before them was so overwhelming and staggering in favor of a 25 per cent reduction that they (the commission) felt that they must recommend that much reduction, unless they could get some one to break down or explain away that evidence. When the case had been made out by persons appearing before the commission making so strong a showing as to the exorbitant price we are paying, then it was that the postal commission went in search of some one to analyze the facts presented to the commission and to try to explain them away. I do not think the members of the postal commission can object to that statement of mine, for this reason: The majority of the members of the commission were known to be opposed to any reduction of the railway mail pay when they were put on it. More than one distinguished member of the commission had, as a Senator, stated on the floor of the Senate before the commission was appointed that he did not believe there ought to be any reduction, but that he thought the price ought to be raised instead of lowered.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I wish to know whether the Senator's suspicion or want of confidence in Mr. Adams, a man whom I suppose to be entirely above reproach or suspicion—

Mr. BUTLER. I thought I made my remarks about him guarded enough so that even he himself could not object.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I want to know whether it results from anything in Mr. Adams's career or conduct, or whether it results from the Senator's belief that some of the members of the commission meant to have as an expert adviser a man who was biased.

Mr. BUTLER. That is neither here nor there. We have before us for determination too big a subject for the Senator to be justified in using his massive brain in hairsplitting. I wish he would give some attention—and I am sorry that in the past he has given very little—to the facts presented in connection with this matter, and facts from the official reports. If he will put his massive intellect on the merits of the question, and help us to arrive at a just conclusion, his personal desire for information on that hairsplitting question will soon pass out of his mind; he will forget it, because he will address himself to a great question in the interest of the public welfare. If he will do that, I shall be willing to change my phraseology to suit him or the most fastidious person in the Senate.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I am not a member of the commission, but when the Senator makes what seems to be an imputation upon a man of Mr. Adams's standing, I think he ought to give some reason for his imputation.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not think, as I said before, that I made any imputation. I thought I measured my words so as to be so just to him that even he himself could not object to them. But I stated that I thought he might be looked upon by persons interested in this question as being a person not hostile to corporations and who would not be inclined to favor a reduction of the railway mail pay unless the testimony and facts were overwhelming, and that he would never be inclined to overestimate or give too much weight to any testimony or facts that tended to show that the pay ought to be reduced; and I stated that he would probably do that unconsciously from his surroundings and training. If the professor were now on the floor and were entitled to the privileges of the floor as a Senator, I do not see how he could object to that

statement. If that is any reflection upon him, and if he or anyone else thinks so, I should be glad to amend my language so that it would not be considered a reflection upon him. I am glad to see that the Senator from Connecticut has such a high opinion of Professor Adams. Therefore he should be strongly inclined in favor of my amendment, which is just what Professor Adams recommended.

But, Mr. President, to come back to what I was saying when I was interrupted. Professor Adams was employed, I say, by the commission, and he was put to work analyzing the facts that had been put before the commission, which evidently the commission did not see how to get around. He worked long and laboriously. He went through the testimony; he analyzed it exhaustively; he assisted the commission in many other ways, I understand. He arrived at a conclusion as the commission's own expert, and I have simply taken his conclusion and his recommendation and embodied them in this amendment literally, letter for letter. To this fact I call the special attention of Senators who have in the past voted against any reduction. So what I want the Senate to realize in the beginning, as it approaches this amendment, is that it is not the amendment I would offer, because I think the reduction is entirely too small.

I have for several sessions of Congress, when the Post-Office appropriation bill has been under consideration, attempted to show that we were paying at least 25 per cent too much, and I have tried to show that was an underestimate when every disputed or questionable piece of evidence had been put aside. With the report of the postal commission before me, with the facts which they have gathered and which they have put in their report, in the face of their report, I believe now there ought to be a reduction of 25 per cent in what we pay for carrying the mail. I hesitated some time about whether I should offer the amendment for a 25 per cent reduction and again take up the facts, as I have shown before and as other Senators have, and attempt to prove that that amendment was justified; that the public interest demanded it, as a matter of equity, and that the railroads would still have a fair profit—indeed, a big profit—or whether I should offer an amendment covering the very conservative and extremely low estimate of Professor Adams. But I am trying to arrive at some result.

I feared if I offered an amendment for 25 per cent reduction I would not be able to secure its passage. I know how difficult it is for Senators to get their fellow-Senators to listen to what they say. I know how difficult it is even for the older Senators here, those of long service and of recognized great wisdom and experience, to get the ear of a majority of Senators on any question so as to have them pass upon the facts as they present them to the Senate. I know it is practically impossible to get as many as half a dozen Senators in this body to examine this report, much less to hear and consider what I or any other Senator may say. Therefore, in order that there might be something done, a very small remedy, I have accepted the recommendation of Professor Adams and I have embodied it in this amendment, and Senators who desire to see this can turn to page 240 of the commission's report, part 2, and they will find there the recommendations that he makes and his conclusions.

He recommends a horizontal reduction of 5 per cent on all lines. Then he recommends a percentage reduction on the lines that carry the greatest quantity of mail—a percentage running from 1 per cent to 12 per cent on the most dense routes. He estimates that that will make a total reduction of about 9 per cent or probably a little less, putting 5 per cent horizontal on all lines and then giving a further reduction of a little less than 4 per cent on the roads that carry the great bulk of the railway mail.

I think a horizontal reduction of 10 per cent would be too small, and I think the facts justify it. I admit that there is an element of equity in having a horizontal reduction of so much and then making the additional reduction on the lines that carry the greatest bulk of mail. So the form of amendment recommended by Professor Adams is probably nearer justice; but my objection to it is that it is too small.

In 1876 we made a reduction of 10 per cent, and in 1878, twenty-three years ago, we made a further reduction of 5 per cent on mail pay. From that day until this we have not made a reduction. We are paying to-day exactly the same on every 100 pounds of mail carried by any road, or 1,000 pounds carried by any road, or 100,000 pounds carried by any road per ton per mile that we paid then.

Four years ago, when this matter was under discussion, I called the attention of the Senate to the facts. Here is the report of the commission that admits those facts. I next called the attention of the Senate to the fact that during the twenty-three years since there has been any reduction in railway mail pay freight rates had gone down 44 per cent and passenger rates had gone down 21 per cent, and yet during all this time the Government had continued to pay just exactly dollar for dollar what it did when freight

rates were 44 per cent higher and when passenger rates were 21 per cent higher.

I stated these facts on the floor of the Senate two years ago. I stated it four years ago, as the RECORD shows, and here is the report of the commission that admits it.

When I made the statement two years ago the Senator from Iowa challenged it and said I must be mistaken, and even if I were right it was a matter of great enough importance to be officially investigated before Congress should act.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] rose, and in one of his gushing efforts he said the Senator from North Carolina was blessed with a most vivid imagination and an abundance of words, and that his imagination and his abundance of words made him magnify facts. "Now," he said, "clearly the Senator is wrong about these facts." He said, "We want to investigate and see what the facts are, and when we get them then we can act intelligently." Here is the Senator's report admitting the very facts I stated, which caused him to put forth his attempted-to-be-humorous, gushing effort; and yet, after the Senator got the facts which he then denied were true, he does not recommend a reduction.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will ask the Senator what facts were developed by the inquiry which were then denied?

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator attempted to ridicule my facts and arguments by saying that I was blessed with a very vivid imagination, and said that my imagination magnified the facts. At that time I was stating how much the freight rates had been reduced since 1878, how much passenger rates had been reduced, showing that the cost of railway transportation had been reduced. I was showing how much coal had gone down in price, how much steel had gone down in price, how much cheaper a locomotive with a train of cars could be hauled to-day than it could then; and that as the result of that, not so much the result of competition, for we had not competition, the freight rates and passenger rates had been steadily going down.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I suppose the Senator is aware of the fact that the statistics show since 1880 that passenger rates have decreased 21 per cent, freight rates have decreased 44 per cent—

Mr. BUTLER. I have just stated that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And mail rates have decreased 39 per cent.

Mr. BUTLER. Ah, but there is the subterfuge. The Senator is not correct about the reduction of mail rates.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There is no subterfuge.

Mr. BUTLER. Ah, but it is. I was coming to that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I hope the Senator will bear witness that any reference I made to the Senator's gifted imagination was made in the utmost good faith; and I should be very unwilling ever to admit that it was not true. As to his flow of words, he will show us this afternoon whether or not he is gifted in that direction. But I beg him to believe it was in good faith entirely that I made the suggestion which I did.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not question but that it was in good faith, and I think the Senator labored hard in this report to prove that he was right when he made the observation; but I will say that the facts in the report show that, while the statement was made in good faith probably, it was wrong, and that my facts were right, as he has just quoted them from the report. He has just quoted from his own report the facts that I was giving to the Senate two years ago when he indulged in his remarks about my imagination running away with the facts and magnifying them. He has stated them here in his own report, and he would not have done it if he could have helped it, because he did not then want to believe them, and declared they were not correct. Now he comes in and says they have dug up and found that mail rates have been reduced 39 per cent.

With all due deference to the Senator, he knows that is not correct. He has put it in his report, but the report shows that it is not correct, except technically. It is like a thing being stated for the truth when it is false. It is like stating a technical truth that is a literal falsehood.

Now, what are the facts? I am quoting from the report now, which proves that that statement is not true when you apply it.

We are paying to-day, I repeat, the same amount on a hundred pounds of mail carried by road that we paid for a hundred pounds of mail in 1878. To a road that carried a thousand pounds then we are paying a rate that carries a thousand pounds now, exactly the same money to a cent. To a road that carried a hundred thousand pounds we are paying now to a road that carries a hundred thousand pounds exactly the same money to a cent. I challenge the Senator to deny it. He can not do it. These are the facts.

When the Senator comes and dodges around and says that we have reduced railway mail pay 39 per cent, how does he figure it out? He ought to be candid with the country and the Senate. His interruption just now, in what he said, was intended to mislead, not to give information.

What are the facts? Take a road that was carrying 100 pounds of mail in 1878. Some of those roads have increased their bulk so that under the law as it existed then the pay the road would get has been decreased in cents per pound, but the road is making more money than it made in 1878 when it carried a hundred pounds.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let me ask the Senator if the railroads were carrying only the same tonnage of freight now that they carried in 1880 and in cars carrying no more freight, does he believe freight rates would have been so much reduced? Does he not know that it is because the volume of business has been increased and the size of the cars has been so increased that a hundred thousand weight of car will now carry 60 to 80 tons of freight? The volume has increased, and therefore freight rates are less. In mail the increased volume automatically brings the percentage of cost down until it almost equals the reduction on freight rates, whereas in mail transportation the increased volume does not lead to an increased capacity to carry in fewer cars, but the postal cars continue to carry from 3 tons to 2½ tons in each car, so that the increase imposes an additional burden on the railroad in mail and less upon both freight and passengers.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, there is some force in what the Senator says, but it does not explain away the fact, because, as his report shows, and as I showed two years ago and four years ago, and as I am going to show again, the greatest part of the reduction in freight rates has been due to the reduced cost of hauling the mail train or freight train or passenger train. To-day we have roads that are hauling no more freight or passengers than they hauled in 1878, and they are hauling them at a greatly reduced cost; but the mail pay is the same, and, when the increase of mail has been as large on a road as the increase of freight, still we are paying the same per pound for the mail, while the freight is carried at 44 per cent less. That is the fact, and the Senator can not deny it. These facts were brought out in the testimony, and that evidence has been produced to the Senate for the last four or five years, even before this commission was ever appointed. In fact, the commission was appointed to try to explain away these facts.

Mr. President, as I stated before, the road to-day that is getting less for carrying the bulk of mail that it carries per pound than it did in 1878 is making more money than it did, because under the scale of grading in the law of 1878 they left the largest profit to roads that carried the largest amount of mail. Indeed, we did not grade down the price to them when they got above 5,000 pounds. Does the Senator think if it was fair to limit the grading down of the mail at 5,000 pounds in 1878 we ought to keep the limit down to 5,000 pounds now?

How many roads were carrying as much as 5,000 pounds then? How many roads to-day are carrying more than that? The increased bulk of the mail has made it necessary that we should raise that limit from 5,000 pounds much higher, and as high in proportion as the bulk of the mail has increased.

The Senator brought out those facts in his testimony, but he refused to consider them in his recommendation. The expert whom you employed did consider them, and he said unquestionably the increase in the bulk of mail should require us to increase the limit, and not stop at 5,000 pounds, where the grading stopped under the law of 1878.

Why, Mr. President, the railroad that carries over 5,000 pounds to-day for every 2,000 more gets over \$31, and it gets that if it was to carry five hundred thousand million pounds. Will the Senator say that it is fair to stop at that small amount and pay this enormous amount on the great increase of bulk that the road is carrying? The facts are brought out in this testimony which show that that is the case; and yet the Senator and his commission refused to consider that in making up their conclusion. But Professor Adams did.

Before proceeding further with my discussion of this matter I wish to say that the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Iowa and other Senators thought we ought to pay the roads more than we are paying them, and that inasmuch as freight rates had gone down mail rates ought to go up, and that inasmuch as passenger rates had gone down mail rates ought to go up; but not having any argument with which to meet the facts placed before the Senate, at last they proposed as an excuse, as a subterfuge, behind which to hide and give them time, that a commission should be appointed to investigate.

The commission was appointed. When it was appointed I and other Senators tried to get some time fixed when the commission would report. We stated over and over again that the commission ought to be able to bring in a report in a year at least to show that our facts were wrong. I think they led us to believe that possibly they would; but they did not want to limit themselves. I offered an amendment limiting it and requiring it to report before the next appropriation bill was up. They opposed it, and appealed to the Senate to vote it down and give them a chance to "make a fair, full, and complete investigation of this great and important subject." They had their way and got their

chance. What have they done? The end of the year came around and the commission had just begun. So when we came to pass the appropriation bill they said, "Oh, there is no use for you to make an effort now to reduce railway mail pay; we have not investigated it," and then they appealed to the Senate to give them another year.

The end of the second year ran around and the commission were not ready to report. They had not found enough experts. With the help of the railroad corporations in the country and their attorneys they had not been able to pick up enough facts and figures to deny and set aside the arguments which they ridiculed as being feeble when presented by myself and others, and so they prayed for more time. For three years we have been paying anywhere from \$10,000,000 or more than a fair price, in my judgment, and they have held us off and appealed to the Senate "that inasmuch as you are ignorant, let the law stay like it is and keep voting this money and we will report after a while."

Now, here at last comes a report. The commission is divided. There are not more than two of them who agree about anything, except they did manage to get a majority to agree that we were not paying too much for carrying the mails. To my astonishment, they stopped there and did not recommend that we should increase the price, because one was just as logical as the other. If I had been going to make a recommendation against any reduction, I would have just gone the whole length and recommended increasing the pay, because one would have been just as logical as the other.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, the Senator says the majority. The Senator will bear me out in the statement that six of the eight members of the Railway Mail Pay Commission—

Mr. BUTLER. A majority was against the pneumatic tube.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But six of the eight recommended that there be no reduction in the railway mail pay.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, Mr. President, that is, I think, correct; but then there is no report signed by more than two members.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh!

Mr. BUTLER. One report is signed by two members of the commission; then another report is signed by one and concurred in by another, with a reservation; and another report is signed by another and concurred in by another with a reservation, and the minority report is signed by two.

Now, Mr. President, we have wasted three years, and about \$30,000,000 have been paid in excess on railway mail pay while we were getting this investigation, and we have got now to decide whether or not we will reduce it. I submit that we can not do that very intelligently without examining to some extent the report, the facts on which the majority and the minority reports are based. If we do not look at the testimony, the inclination of Senators is that here is a majority report one way and a minority report the other, and it is a safe rule with the average man, when he does not know what is right himself, to vote to do nothing. So we are in that fix after wasting three years and entailing a great expense. We are now where we have got to dig down into this report and get up the facts again to the Senate and let the Senate see what they are.

As preliminary to doing that I want the Senate to hear read the majority and the minority reports on railway mail pay. Therefore I ask the Secretary to read, beginning on page 6, headed "Railway mail pay," down to page 19, where the report stops on that subject. Let him begin on page 5, under the subhead, "Character of the evidence presented," for it might be fair toward the commission to take their statement as to how they got their evidence and the character of their evidence. Begin on page 5, "Character of the evidence presented."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from North Carolina is not going to have read the hundred and more pages of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado object?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I do not object, but I am asking the Senator from North Carolina, through the medium of the Chair, whether or not he desires to have it all read.

Mr. BUTLER. I will say to the Senator, in all frankness, that I believe if Senators will listen to the majority report, and then the minority report of Mr. FLEMING, which is concurred in by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], that they can both be read quicker than I could explain the two reports, because I would naturally use more words in an offhand speech than a concise report. The testimony is voluminous, but these reports are short and simply refer to the pages of the testimony on which they base their findings.

I must say that the majority report only quotes evidence in favor of railroads and fails to see any evidence in favor of the Government and taxpayers in making up the report. It does seem to

me that the commission to investigate this important question would have at least presented the salient points of the evidence on both sides and said in their report that the evidence on one side will be found on pages so and so that shows this, and the evidence on the other side found on pages so and so will show that, and then, having presented the facts fairly to the Senate in their report, given their conclusion. I regret the commission did not do it. I do not want to criticize the commission unjustly, but I can not understand why they have made such a one-sided and incomplete report. It may be that they needed two years more. I rather think myself that three years was a very short time for them to prepare this short report. Of course we were pressing for a report, and their report shows every evidence of haste, to say the least.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am sorry the Senator from North Carolina feels so badly, but I can not help that. What I am doing now is to appeal to him if he will not shorten the consideration of it by not insisting upon the reading of the long report. He has a perfect right to do it. I should not make the objection to the clerk reading it; I never would make that objection; but it is only to the time taken up that I object. I hope the Senator will not insist upon it. I think many of the Senators here have read the majority report and the minority report, and I hope the Senator will not take the time.

Mr. BUTLER. I have not yet spoken to a Senator who has had time to read it. There may be some who have read it. Besides, Mr. President, I should feel compelled to read a large part of it, and, besides, I should feel compelled to turn to the evidence to which they refer, and especially the evidence on the other side to which they do not refer, and I may have to do that anyway.

There are several places where the evidence they refer to I think ought to be read; and it is the evidence on the other side that the commission does not refer to that is in these volumes. That is one thing I do complain of. I have a right to complain of it, and the Senate has a right to complain that all the important evidence to contradict that they do quote from is not referred to in the report. Attention ought to be called to that, because it does show to my judgment that the findings of the commission were wrong, the evidence taken by themselves and published in this report, which unfortunately few Senators can find the time to read, and which I admit is a great burden on anyone to have to read.

Now, Mr. President, I do not see how we can expedite matters any faster than to read the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the report, if there be no objection. Is there objection?

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to inquire of the Senator how long the report is?

Mr. BUTLER. I have only asked to have read pages 6 to 19.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I am on the Senator's side of this question, but I do not think it is right to have a full report read when a discussion of this kind is going on. Of course it will take a long time and we are very near the close of the session. Moreover, I personally am anxious that there should be an extra session, but other Senators are not, and we certainly can not pass the appropriation bills—

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator is more anxious that there should be an extra session than he would be if attending it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am largely anxious because I can not be here and I want to see other people work. But, Mr. President, I do think that the Senator ought not to insist on having this whole report read. I hope he will read from it such portions of it as he wants to emphasize.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I would feel more disposed to comply with the request if in digesting the matter we could have anything like a full Senate for a reasonable time to state a synopsis of it, but it is impossible to have that. The most we can hope to do in the reading is that some Senators would hear one part and other Senators another part. A Senator might take up an hour here in making a condensed synopsis and doing what I am sorry the commission did not do, contrasting the testimony, and he would probably be heard by a dozen or half a dozen Senators during that time.

I do feel like the facts here justify a 25 per cent reduction, and with all due respect to the commission, I believe a majority of the Senate would vote for it if they could get at the gist of the facts, at least a majority of Senators would agree to the slight reduction recommended by the minority of the commission. The majority report is of very little value, and my only purpose in asking it to be read was that Senators might see that my criticisms of it were warranted, and that therefore the Senate should not be guided by its conclusions.

Now, Mr. President, inasmuch as the majority report is of very little value, I yield to the desire of Senators to save time and will ask to have read the minority report, or rather that part of it relating to the railway mail pay, which is much shorter and more intelligent and valuable than the other.

Mr. CHANDLER. I was going to say to the Senator he might have the excellent minority report of Mr. FLEMING and myself,

which is short, read, and omit the long report of the majority of the commission, which, after all, has not very much in it.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, I think the Senator's observation is justified, because the minority report does cover the testimony on both sides, and treats it, it seems to me, more fairly than the majority report. A person interested in hearing both sides comes far nearer getting it from the minority report. On page 35, Mr. President, the part of Mr. FLEMING's minority report treating of the railway mail pay begins. I will ask the Secretary to read, beginning at that point.

In this connection, before the reading begins, I might call the attention of the Senate to statements made to the Senate by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] and myself, the facts advanced to prove our position two years ago and four years ago, to the effect that we are paying to-day twice as much for carrying mail as the passenger pays per pound to be hauled in luxurious palace cars. The commission have not been able to disprove that. They have tried to get around it by saying they did not think it was a fair way to make a comparison. I have here before me a report of the Postmaster-General, who sent Mr. Shallenberger, his Second Assistant Postmaster-General, to Europe to study the railway mail conditions and pay of every country in Europe, and he comes back and reports that he thinks the passenger service is the fairest comparison that can be made. Now, why did the commission do that? It seems to me they found that they could not disprove our facts, and, in an offhand way, they simply say, "Oh, well, we do not think that is a fair comparison."

Mr. WOLCOTT. I dislike to interrupt the Senator from North Carolina, because it just consumes so much more time, but I will say to him that a very careful estimate was made by a witness who shows that, although the comparison is a ludicrous and a ridiculous one, the cost of carrying a passenger, the charge for a passenger on a regular passenger train, is greater in weight than that of the mails carried. The Senator will find the evidence in the paper submitted by an official of the Burlington road where the weights were taken at Lincoln.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, the way the comparison was made was to take a car that would carry 60 passengers and then they would estimate a full car of 60 passengers as against a mail car of 2 tons.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, they took the average number of people carried in a certain number of trains, in each coach, the average weight of the passenger and the average weight of his luggage.

Mr. BUTLER. There is other testimony the Senator probably did not see which is overlooked entirely, which takes the average number of passengers. The witnesses were asked how many go on this road, this, that, or the other, what was the number of passengers. In a car which would carry 60 passengers the average number would be 9 to 12. That was compared with the amount of mail actually carried. I will say to the Senator, to save the time of the Senate, I can give it to him in condensed form, the comparison showed that the claims we made two years ago that the pay was twice as large for a passenger as for mail is correct. A number of roads are given and the average number of passengers carried and the passenger car average is set forth and the amount of mail in the mail car on the same train taken.

We also showed the great excess we pay for mail over what the express companies pay, that it is ten times as much that we pay for a pound of mail as the express companies pay to the railroads, and the express companies pay to the railroads only about one-half of what they get. Then we compared the freight service, and while we admitted the difficulty of making a fair and just and accurate estimate by such comparisons, yet the comparisons did throw great light on the fact that there were tremendous inequalities, and that freight rates, which are one-fourty-fourth as much as mail rates, had gone down over 40 per cent, while mail rates have gone down nothing, and that passenger rates, while only one-half the mail rates per pound, had gone down 21 per cent, while under the law of 1878 the mail rates have not gone down a cent. The apparent reduction claimed by the commission is because roads are carrying more weight, and it is under the grading-down for increased weight and that is all. If you take the percentage on mail there is a larger bulk of it carried than there was, but that is not a fair comparison and is misleading, because at the rate we are carrying mail to-day, for 100,000 pounds of mail we pay precisely what we paid for 100,000 pounds in 1878 on the same car on the same road.

Those are facts that the commission does not deny. They simply get around this grading business to make a showing. That I submit is not fair.

Now, Mr. President, this minority report while indorsing the recommendation of Professor Adams for a small reduction, admits that it is too small. It admits that they are making a conservatively low estimate. Yet that report, based on facts in this testimony, bears out practically everything that I and other Senators have contended for, who have been making an effort to reduce railway mail pay.

I ask that the minority report, beginning where it is marked, be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

RAILWAY MAIL PAY.

Upon the subject of railway mail pay I am unable to agree to the conclusions contained in the report signed by the chairman and other members of the commission. I freely admit the perplexities of the problem. I agree in the opinion that the cost to the railroads of hauling the mail can not be ascertained with entire accuracy. I am also fully convinced that those persons who have contended that under the law of 1873 and its amendments of 1876 and 1878 the railroads are being paid, as some have charged, from two to ten times what they should receive, are in grave error. There is no such exorbitant overpayment for the total transportation of the mails as has been charged. But I am decidedly of the opinion that the facts presented to this commission do not warrant the conclusion that the railway mail pay should not be reduced at all.

At an early stage of our proceedings it became apparent that the commission needed the assistance of some expert statistician acquainted with railway and transportation problems in order to reconcile, if possible, the conflicting testimony and ascertain with some degree of definiteness the proper data on which a just report could be based. Accordingly, Mr. Henry C. Adams, professor of political economy and finance at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., and also statistician of the Interstate Commerce Commission, was employed to investigate the subject and report. Mr. Adams gave months of time to his investigation, and was assisted in his work by a large force of clerks. He made his report to our commission under date of February 1, 1900, and it will be found in Part II of the testimony at page 171. His conclusions were as follows:

"First. It is proposed that the present rate of compensation on all routes shall be reduced by 5 per cent.

"Second. It is proposed that all routes receiving in excess of 20 cents per ton per mile shall be subjected to a further reduction at a uniformly progressing rate, the rate of progression being indicated in the following table:

Scheme for progressive reduction of railway mail pay.

Classification of roads* (cents per ton per mile).	Reduction applying to each class of roads in addition to a uniform reduction of 5 per cent.	Classification of roads* (cents per ton per mile).	Reduction applying to each class of roads in addition to a uniform reduction of 5 per cent.
	<i>Per cent.</i>		<i>Per cent.</i>
16.50 to 20	1	8.80 to 9.20	7
14 to 16.50	2	8.40 to 8.80	8
12.30 to 14	3	8.10 to 8.40	9
11.25 to 12.30	4	7.67 to 8.10	10
10 to 11.25	5	7.34 to 7.67	11
9.20 to 10	6	7 to 7.34	12

*On the basis of rates received under the present laws by which railway compensation is determined.

Professor Adams was subjected to a rigid examination, and his positions were assailed by various representatives of the railroads, but I do not see that his conclusions have been impaired, except, perhaps, in the matter of his comparison of mail rates with the express rates. Mr. Julius, of the American Express Company, seems to have shown that the 100-pound rate selected for comparison by Professor Adams was not a fair typical rate for that purpose.

Professor Adams revised his original statement in some minor particulars, and under pressure of oral examination made some conditional concessions, but as his final matured judgment in the premises he still holds to his recommendations of reduction. The majority of the commission state in their report that "this question (of mail pay) is one of judgment," but after making this admission they forthwith proceed to set aside the deliberate judgment of the best expert they could procure.

After the filing of his report and after his final examination, on April 7, 1900, with all the additional light he could obtain, Professor Adams makes the further statement that his proposed reduction of 5 per cent is "justified by a consideration of the economies in railway transportation not dependent on increase in the density of mail traffic."

Mr. BUTLER. I regret to see that the distinguished chairman of the Postal Commission is out of his seat. Here is matter in the testimony, on page 240, which shows that he was entirely wrong in the statement he made just before he left the Chamber, when he interrupted me to say that this reduction in the freight rates was due to the great bulk of freight carried.

[At this point Mr. BUTLER yielded to Mr. PETTIGREW, who raised the question of the presence of a quorum.]

Wednesday, February 20, 1901.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, when this bill was laid aside the Secretary was reading from the minority report of Mr. FLEMING. I will ask the Secretary to resume the reading where he discontinued—on page 36, near the bottom of the page.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

After the filing of his report and after his final examination, on April 7, 1900, with all the additional light he could obtain, Professor Adams makes the further statement that his proposed reduction of 5 per cent is "justified by a consideration of the economies in railway transportation not dependent on increase in the density of mail traffic." (Part II, p. 240.) I believe this recommendation of Professor Adams is entirely justified, unless it can be shown that the rate of pay established under the law of 1873 and the amendments of 1876 and 1878, including even the postal-car pay, was grossly inadequate at that time.

Mr. BUTLER. I call attention to the statement made by the chairman of the Post-Office Committee, and also the chairman of

the Postal Commission, that the increased quantity of mail did not justify a reduction, because there was not the same economy connected with it as with the increased quantity of freight, and therefore there should be no reduction. I call his attention to Professor Adams's finding, which the minority report quotes and indorses. Professor Adams finds that there ought to be a horizontal reduction of 5 per cent, regardless of the quantity of mail, without taking the increased bulk into consideration at all. That is, supposing the amount of mail carried to-day was the same as that carried in 1878, when we made the last reduction, and that no road carried any more, still there should be a reduction of 5 per cent on account of the economy in carrying all kinds of freight, passengers, and mail and express matter now from what was the cost in 1878. The chairman seems to have overlooked that in the statement he made when the bill was before under consideration. I call his attention, and I call the attention of the Senate, to the fact in this connection, so that the Senators who heard his statement may know that the expert employed by the commission found to the contrary.

The Senator seemed to place his whole plea for opposing a reduction upon the fact that there was not the same profit to the railroads in hauling an increased amount of mail as there is in hauling an increased amount of freight; but the expert finds, regardless of that, even if the Senator was correct—and he does not agree with the Senator's statement even on that point—that still there should be a reduction of 5 per cent regardless of the increased quantity of mail.

I now ask the Secretary to proceed with the reading. I merely wanted to emphasize that point at this place.

The Secretary resumed and continued the reading, as follows:

Coal, pig iron, and steel rails enter largely into the cost of railway operation and construction. The price of hard coal in 1873 was about \$4.27 per ton; in 1899 it was \$3.75 per ton, a decrease of 52 cents per ton, or more than 12 per cent. The figures for soft coal are: In 1873, \$4.84, and in 1899, \$3, a decrease of \$2.84 per ton, or more than 58 per cent. In 1873 the price of pig iron No. 1 was \$42.75 per ton; in 1899 it was \$19.36, a decrease of \$23.39 per ton, or more than 54 per cent. In 1873 the price of steel rails was \$130.50 per ton; in 1899 it was \$32.12 per ton; a decrease of \$98.38 per ton, or more than 76 per cent. Since 1873 there have also been vast savings to railroads by reason of the consolidation of small lines into compact systems, and this principle of economy is still being extensively applied and will no doubt continue to be applied in the future in obedience to a law more inexorable than statutes.

Mr. BUTLER. Here are some very significant statistics prepared by Professor Adams, which no one questions. The majority of the commission in making their report did not question these statistics nor offer anything in rebuttal. What is it? That since we reduced the railway mail pay in 1878, the cost of coal, a very important item, has been reduced 52 cents per ton; soft coal has decreased in price 58 per cent—over half; the decrease in the cost of pig iron has been 54 per cent—over half; on steel rails the decrease has been 76 per cent. These are some of the items, and they are the biggest items, in the cost of building railroads, laying tracks, and operating.

Here we have a reduction running from 50 to 76 per cent on every important item of cost in building and operating a railroad; and yet with these facts furnished to the commission by Professor Adams, the statistician of the Interstate Commerce Commission, not rebutted, not controverted or questioned, but in fact indorsed by all of the commission, I call attention to the fact that the majority of the commission recommend that we ought not to reduce the railway mail pay, but they do not give any reason for it; they do not attempt to explain away these facts, because it is impossible to do it.

What else does Professor Adams find in addition to that? He finds that these are not all the economies. There have been great consolidations. First, they began by taking little independent roads and grouping them into a system. That was a great economy; that reduced operating expenses; it reduced the number of employees and the number of superintendents, and it reduced the number of high-salaried men. Next, they began to consolidate these systems, into greater systems, until to-day we have practically the whole railway mileage of the United States in two or three systems, and they have a community of interest and soon will be in one gigantic system. Within the last week the daily press has contained statements sent out by the Associated Press of the great economies that are being effected each day by these consolidations. The other day, when negotiations were begun for consolidating the Union Pacific and the Southern Pacific, so as to have a shorter line between Chicago and New York, the press announced how much saving there would be. It is true many men were thrown out of employment, but there was a saving to the companies.

When the Northern Pacific and the Great Northern arranged their community of interest, then arranged a community of interest with the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul, then with another system of railways to New York, and then arranged for a line around the world in connection with steamers, again the press announced what a great saving there would be in the operation of all these lines by means of that consolidation.

That is an enormous item. Neither Professor Adams nor the commission has undertaken to say what the percentage of saving will be, because it is probably impossible at this transition period to approximate it; but yet that is an important item, to say nothing of the reduced cost of coal, iron, steel, etc., everyone will admit. It is self-evident. And these last great economies have been consummated since the commission made its report.

Here are these facts stated, and yet the chairman of the commission tells us that there is no evidence to show that the Government payments for carrying the mail ought to be reduced lower than it was in 1878, simply because he says there is not the same saving, the same profit, in the increased bulk of the mail as there is in the increased bulk of freight, when all of these facts show that there ought to be a reduction on account of the economies of transportation, even if the Senator is correct in his statement; and Professor Adams does not agree with him even in that statement. I now ask the Secretary to proceed with the reading from the report.

The Secretary resumed and continued the reading, as follows:

Is mail transportation entitled to no benefit at all from such sweeping reductions in the cost of operation?

A railroad that moved a given amount of freight in 1881 moved the same amount of freight in 1888 at a reduction of 44 per cent (Part II, p. 224), while a road that carried a given amount of mail in 1879 carried the same amount of mail in 1900 without any reduction whatever. It is true the general mail rate was reduced from 20.59 cents per ton per mile to 12.56 cents per ton per mile between the years 1881 and 1888, but this reduction was due to the increased weight of the mail carried over the particular road that received the payment. While the law of 1873 was based on a scale of progressive reduction up to 5,000 pounds, the form of that law has not been changed since its first enactment. The railroad carrying 100,000 pounds of mail in 1900 is receiving exactly the same pay that was received in 1879 by a road which carried the same weight of 100,000 pounds.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate to this paragraph, because the chairman of the committee stated when the bill was last under consideration that there had been an enormous reduction of 37 or 39 per cent in railway mail pay, and he said that in answer to the fact which I quoted from the report, showing that freight rates had been reduced 44 per cent and that passenger rates had been reduced 21 per cent. He was on his feet in an instant, and said, "the Senator forgets, and fails to note the fact that the pay for the mail has been reduced 37 per cent." The statement of the Senator was not correct. There has been no reduction. As this report states, we are paying to-day exactly to the cent as much for 100,000 pounds of mail carried on a given road as we paid in 1878.

The Senator will not deny that statement; and that shows the absurdity of his statement; it shows that his statement is only technically correct, while it is in fact absolutely wrong. If the Senator can deny my statement, I pause for him to do so, because I want the Senators who have not investigated this matter to get all of the facts; and if the Senator from Colorado makes a statement and I contradict it, I ask him to explain where my statement is wrong and why it is wrong. I say we are paying to-day exactly the same amount of money to the cent for 100,000 pounds of mail on a given road that we paid in 1878; that there has not been one cent of reduction, while freight rates have been reduced 44 per cent and passenger rates 21 per cent.

The chairman seems to be engaged, and I shall pause, for I want it to go into the RECORD right here, if there is any answer to it, and if what I have said is incorrect I want to hear from the chairman of the committee, because I want Senators to see these two statements right together in the RECORD.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I beg the Senator's pardon. Did he ask me a question? I was for the moment interrupted.

Mr. BUTLER. I called attention to the fact just quoted from the report, that to the same road, carrying 100,000 pounds of mail, we are paying to-day precisely the same amount that we paid in 1878, without one cent of reduction. Is that correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If a railroad carries an increased amount of mail it receives a less percentage of pay. The rate has been uniform since 1878. For 200 pounds it is at the rate of \$1.17 a ton; and then it is reduced, until in the conduct of the business, it goes as low as 6.58 cents, the average pay received being 12 cents plus per ton per mile.

Mr. BUTLER. That is what the Senator said before, but he would not directly answer my question. I want to get that perfectly plain. A railroad carrying, in 1878, 100,000 pounds of mail received a certain amount of money, and if the same road is carrying to-day the same amount of mail, does it not get exactly the same amount of pay?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Identically the same amount of money.

Mr. BUTLER. Exactly. I say that every road in the country that carries 5,000 pounds of mail gets exactly the same amount of money to a cent to-day that it got then. A road carrying 50,000 pounds of mail gets exactly the same amount of money to-day that it did in 1878.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Senator will also, I suppose, dwell upon the fact that by the increased business of the railroads the 100,000

pounds of mail which might formerly have been carried on one train are now distributed among thirty trains.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator mean by that observation that because the amount of mail which a railroad carries is increased so enormously that they must have more trains on account of more mails, more passengers, and more freight that that is a great hardship to the railroads?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Take, for instance, the road between New York and Philadelphia. The mail could presumably be carried on half a dozen trains, but it is carried, as a matter of fact, on 140 trains every day. From Philadelphia to Pittsburg the mail might be carried on half a dozen trains, but the Government exacts that it shall be carried on 111 trains each day between those two points. It is not the mail business, but it is the general business of the road which has so increased that each 100,000 pounds of mail, for which the same pay is given as in 1878, is necessarily carried on more trains, because the Post-Office Department exacts that the railroads shall carry mail upon their fast trains, their slow trains, and upon every other kind of train that will facilitate the receipt and delivery of letters.

Mr. BUTLER. The testimony in the Senator's own report shows, and Professor Adams shows, that the increase in mail has been greater than the increase in the freight and passenger traffic.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is very true as to the percentage of increase.

Mr. BUTLER. The railroads, on account of the increased business, on account of the increased freight on which they make a profit, and the increased number of passengers on which they make a profit, find it profitable to put on more trains. But here is the report, which shows that the amount of mail has increased faster than the amount of freight and the number of passengers. The Senator says that it is a great hardship, because the country is so prosperous and the railroads are so prosperous that they find it profitable to put on more trains, when the fact is that the amount of mail increases faster than the freight and passengers, which have called for this increased car service. That is one of the reasons given by the commission for advising no reduction when, in fact, it is a strong reason why there should be a reduction.

In this connection, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in 1878, when we last fixed the rate of railway mail pay, we put a limit of 5,000 pounds and had no reduction in pay for any increased amount above that point. Why did we do that? The amount of mail which one road carried was small in bulk, and yet we arbitrarily fixed the limit of 5,000 pounds, and when a road carried over that amount there was no reduction in pay for the increase in bulk. Will the Senator say to-day, with the enormous increase of bulk, an increase that has been greater than the increase of freight and greater than the increase of passengers, that we ought to keep a limit of 5,000 pounds, and make no reduction for the road carrying 300,000 pounds? Yet they recommend no such reduction; but here they say, what? They recommend that we keep the law precisely as it is. One reason given in 1873, when the first act was passed, for putting the limit at 5,000 pounds, was because of the small amount of mail that each road carried.

Mr. President, in this connection I want to call the attention of the Senate to the manner in which the present law works. I want the attention of the chairman of the committee, and I want Senators to know if I make a misstatement that the chairman is here to correct it; and I do not want him to wait until I get through, for I want the two statements to go down side by side in the RECORD.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, Mr. President, I can not undertake that contract. I must beg that the Senator will finish his remarks. I would not presume to interrupt every statement of the Senator with which I do not agree. He must excuse me. I will try to follow him when he concludes.

Mr. BUTLER. I will not ask the Senator, then, if I draw a deduction or give an opinion, to correct me, for we would never agree in our opinions; but, in his opinion, if I make a misstatement of facts or make a quotation which he thinks does not correctly represent the facts, I think it is his duty to call my attention and the attention of the Senate to it. I want to state the facts fairly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not, Mr. President.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, I want to say, if the Senator refuses to do so now, it is because he can not do so. I put him right now on his mettle, and put him on notice, that he can not deny or contradict what I say, because if he attempted to do so he would come out worsted; and he would prove that, according to his own report, there ought to be a reduction, and that that is a correct deduction from the facts in his own report.

How does this present law work? We pay a road to-day that carries only 200 pounds of mail \$44.75 per mile per annum. We decrease the amount of pay per 100 pounds up to 5,000 pounds, until the road that carries 5,000 pounds gets \$171; then from 5,000 pounds up there is not a particle of reduction. The automatic re-

duction, about which the Senator speaks stops right there. Then for every increase of 500 pounds we pay about \$6; for every increase of 1,000 pounds we pay about \$12; and we pay at that same rate if they carry 1,000,000 pounds.

How does it work? When they carry 10,000 pounds, what does the road get? Two hundred and twenty-five dollars. There is no reduction; the amount paid is just at the same rate as if they carried only 5,000 pounds. When a road carries 50,000 pounds, what do they get? Six hundred and fifty-three dollars per mile; just the same rate per hundred pounds as if they were carrying only 5,000 pounds. When a road carries 100,000 pounds, what do they get? One thousand one hundred and eighty-seven dollars and sixty-two cents per mile; just the same as if they were carrying only 5,000 pounds. When a road carries 300,000 pounds, what do they get? They get \$3,325.12½ per mile; at the same rate as if they were carrying only 5,000 pounds.

Now, if it is right to reduce the rate of pay on every increase of a hundred pounds up to 5,000 pounds, then is there not more reason that there should be at least the same reduction on every additional hundred pounds above 5,000 pounds?

Professor Adams says what? He says clearly nobody would have ever fixed that limit of 5,000 pounds if the bulk of mail in 1873 had been what it is now. Therefore he draws the conclusion that we ought to make at least a horizontal reduction of 5 per cent on account of the economies in railway transportation, and then we ought to make a reduction of from 1 to 12 per cent on the increased bulk above 5,000 pounds. If we had simply carried out the intent of Congress in 1873, when we changed the law, we would do what Professor Adams recommends, by applying the same automatic reductions to these larger amounts. If that was just to the railroads then, as the law was in 1873, it is just to them now. That is too plain for controversy, and the chairman of the committee will not attempt to deny it. The only reason he can claim that this reduction ought not to be made now is that we paid the roads too little in 1873. Professor Adams says the only way you can get around this reduction now is to say we did not pay the roads enough in 1873. Who will have the cheek to make that claim?

There is the whole matter in a nutshell. I might read from this testimony, and I might talk for a week and pile up the testimony and the evidence, but this would be the conclusion, and this is the gist of the whole matter. There is not one word in this majority report that contradicts that. There is not one particle of testimony that contradicts it. In fact, I take these facts from the testimony taken by the commission. I am not quoting the facts that I gave two years ago and four years ago, but they are substantially correct, as this report shows. I quote now the official facts in this report.

I believe the reduction ought to be 25 per cent. I believe then there would be an enormous profit, as I think I have demonstrated several times when this question has been under consideration.

Mr. President, certain Senators and certain people in this country seemed to be horrified at the idea of expending \$9,000,000 a year to build up the merchant marine, to put the American flag on the seas, as it was claimed, to enable American vessels to compete with foreign vessels, as it was claimed, to give cheaper transportation of our products to the markets of the world as the friends of the scheme claimed; and yet we raise our hands in holy horror and say, "this is a useless waste of the public money; even if it does accomplish some good, the expense is too great." But the subsidy in this bill for land transportation is bigger than the whole subsidy that would have been carried by the ship-subsidy bill. The amount above a fair profit paid for land transportation of the mails is more than the whole ship-subsidy bill called for. We have been three years getting these facts.

I hope those who thought as I thought about the ship-subsidy bill—that it was not a wise measure, that even if it accomplished some good it was too large an expenditure for what we would have accomplished—will, if the public Treasury is their concern, take just as much interest now in the public Treasury when a larger amount is involved than there was in the ship-subsidy bill, as they took in that measure. I would rather the ship-subsidy bill would pass, as far as the amount of money appropriated is concerned, than that this bill should pass carrying this appropriation, because the hole in the Treasury is bigger above a fair price by this bill. Is it possible that if the American Steamship Line, instead of simply carrying passengers from here to Europe, had had lines running all over the country—a canal in every State, going to the homes of legislators—that the ship-subsidy bill would have passed? It would seem so, if this subsidy is to go through. Let the Secretary proceed with the reading of the report.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is clear to my mind that the majority report opposing any reduction at all in mail pay can not be sustained except upon the theory that the pay was inadequate as it was originally fixed in 1873 and modified in 1876 and 1878, and that theory is not, I think, sustained by the facts.

I think Professor Adams's recommendation for a general reduction of 5 per cent should be enacted into law.

I am also of the opinion that the second recommendation made by Professor Adams, that the form of progressive reduction provided for in the law of 1873, and which has never been changed, should be extended beyond the limit originally fixed of 5,000 pounds, is founded in justice and wisdom. His position on this point is even more unassailable than his other recommendation for a 5 per cent horizontal reduction.

By the law of 1873 the scale of reduction did not apply beyond a weight of 5,000 pounds. For every 2,000 pounds weight above 5,000 pounds the pay is \$21.37½ per mile of route per annum, under the law of 1873, as amended in 1876 and 1878.

Mr. BUTLER. In this connection, inasmuch as this puts it in a different way from what I did, I call the attention of Senators to the fact that for every 2,000 pounds above 5,000 pounds, even if the amount runs to 1,000,000 pounds, under this law, as it stands now, the pay is \$21.37½ per mile, without any reduction for increased bulk. The reduction stops at 5,000 pounds. I called attention to that a few moments ago, but I did not put it in just this shape. The result is the same except this is more striking to show exactly the number of dollars for every 2,000 pounds above 5,000. This is what Professor Adams intends to correct by this progressive reduction of from 1 to 12 per cent on the roads that carry this enormous bulk of mail.

The Secretary will continue to read.

Why 5,000 pounds should have been selected as the point at which the reduction should cease does not appear, but it must have had some relation to the maximum weight of mail carried at that time by the denser routes. The maximum weight on the route from New York to Philadelphia in 1873 was 27,628 pounds; the maximum weight on the same route for 1897 was 309,294 pounds; or, to use Professor Adams's language (Part II, p. 236), "The most dense route in the country (in 1873) carried 16 tons daily per mile," while "routes are not infrequent (now, 1898) carrying 50 to 154 tons daily per mile." There seems to be no good reason why this limit of 5,000 pounds should not be raised to some point nearer the maximum weight now carried.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, we will see that a road which, when this law was passed in 1873, was carrying 16 tons of mail to-day carries 154. Another road, which carried 27,000 pounds in 1873, to-day carries 309,294 pounds, and that is about the rate of increase over the country.

Mr. President, with an increase of from ten to twelve hundred per cent, when you increase the amount of mail ten times to twelve times, then to say that we shall continue to pay on that enormous amount the same rate per ton per mile that we pay on 5,000 pounds is too absurd for any intelligent man to claim it should continue. It carries on its face such evidence of injustice, it is such an unbusinesslike proposition that no man with average intelligence in his private business affairs would tolerate it for a moment. If he did it would bankrupt him, and surely his friends would put him in the lunatic asylum at once.

The Secretary read as follows:

Inasmuch as mail can not be loaded and transported under like economical conditions as freight, it is conceded that the reduction in cost by reason of the increased weight carried can not be as great in proportion for mail as for freight, but that some reduction in cost can be made by reason of the increased weight of mail alone can not well be questioned.

Mr. BUTLER. In this connection I call the attention of Senators to the fact that Professor Adams admits the contention of the Senator from Colorado. The contention of the railroads was that there ought not to be as much reduction for carrying mail by increased weight as for carrying freight. He accepted that suggestion, and he went to work to figure it out to see what relation there was, and after he did he found that, while there ought not to be so great a reduction, still there should be a reduction, and he makes a very conservative recommendation, which he and the majority of the commission all admit is conservative, and the minority of the commission, or Mr. FLEMING's report, I think, admits that he would have made a greater recommendation if Professor Adams had not put it so conservatively, and did not want to disagree with the official statistician, for he wanted to appear to be very conservative himself.

The Secretary read as follows:

That such increase in quantity does diminish to some extent the cost is recognized in almost every transaction involving the distinction between retail and wholesale business. I see no reason why mail pay should be an exception to this practically universal rule, though I freely admit that the extent of the reduction in cost will be lessened by the fact that postal cars can not be loaded up to the same extent as freight cars.

Mr. BUTLER. I stop the reading at this point to call attention to the fact that the chairman of the commission made this point as one reason why there should be no reduction, that you could not load a postal car with the same load that you could a freight car. Professor Adams and the minority of the commission took notice of that. They recognized that fact, and they considered it in making their recommendation. They investigated the whole matter with that in view, and went to work to find out how much reduction there should be, if it could not be in the same proportion. So it shows that every point raised by the Senator from Colorado and the majority of the commission as to why there should not be any reduction has been carefully considered and worked out by Professor Adams and the minority of the commission, and the reduction they recommend is in view of all those things.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is very important in this connection for us to know how much weight of mail matter the postal car can carry. Some witnesses give the average weight at 4,000 pounds, or 2 tons, but Professor Adams is not willing to accept these figures (Part II, p. 233). One witness gives this weight of mail matter as 10,000 pounds, or 5 tons (Part II, p. 710). Mr. Davis, of the Post-Office Department, says that 7,000 pounds, or 3½ tons, is "an easy load" (Part II, p. 234), while it was testified that the postal cars on the Pennsylvania Railroad carried as high as 12,000 pounds, or 6 tons.

Mr. BUTLER. I have to interrupt the reading to call attention to several statements made by the chairman of the committee. I regret he is out. He stated when this bill was last under consideration, and some Senators may have heard his statement, that two or three tons was as much as a postal car could carry, and that therefore there should not be a reduction. Now, here is testimony by the officials of the Post-Office Department, by employees of railroads, showing that the amount carried is all the way from 7,000 pounds up to 12,000 pounds, 6 tons, which is three times the amount the chairman of the committee thought was the amount that they would carry. There is nothing in the report of the majority which contradicts those facts. They did not introduce any testimony to controvert them, and they make their report with these facts unquestioned and uncontradicted here before us. So I think the Senate ought to take notice of those facts, especially since the chairman of the committee gave that as one reason why there should not be any reduction.

The Secretary read as follows:

In this connection I wish to call special attention to the report of Mr. Bradley, of the Post-Office Department, and his specific statement (on p. 153, Part II) that the average weight capacity for storage of letter mail on a 60-foot postal car on the New York and Pittsburgh route was 8,000 pounds; on the New York and Washington route, 10,000 pounds; on the New York, Geneva and Buffalo route, 7,000 pounds, and of a newspaper car on the New York and Pittsburgh route, 12,000 pounds. It is important to observe, too, that these weights are carried in that portion of the postal car "not assigned to distributing furniture."

Besides that, many of the mail trains use storage cars in connection with postal cars, and in this way the amount of mail handled on each postal car is largely increased, without any additional cost except that attached to the storage car, which certainly ought to be placed in the class of a freight car in all essential respects except as to speed.

But, going beyond mere general considerations, Professor Adams (Part II, pp. 233 and 234) makes a specific calculation of the actual cost of carrying the mail in postal cars over the Pennsylvania route. Upon the basis that each car is loaded with 3½ tons (said to be an "easy load"), he shows that the road would expend for its mail service an annual sum per mile of \$2,244, while the compensation for carrying the mail over that route is \$3,422 per mile, an excess of compensation over the cost of \$1,178 per mile. This amount might be considered as part of a reasonable profit but for the fact that in making his computation the professor has already included all operating expenses and, in addition thereto, 33 per cent for fixed charges and dividends, etc. So that the excess of \$1,178 is earned by this road in addition to a full allowance for expenses and profits.

Mr. BUTLER. Inasmuch as members of the commission have told us time and again that there was really no profit to the railroads in the railway mail business, I want to call attention to these facts furnished by Professor Adams, which are not contradicted and which the majority of the commission do not attempt to controvert; that is, that there is a profit per mile of \$1,178, not only above cost, including all operating expenses, but also after we count out 33 per cent for fixed charges and for dividends. In other words, after we take the cost of carrying the mail, every cost that can be conceived of, and then add 33 per cent to cover the fixed charges of every kind, and to cover the profits of the road—that is, the dividends to the stockholders—after enough is added to include that, there was still a surplus of \$1,178 per mile, and the reduction proposed by this amendment would still leave them over two-thirds of that half of that profit above bonus or subsidy.

Surely no conscientious legislator would deliberately vote to tax the people to pay the railroads more than a fair profit. But here is the proof to show that we are taxing the public to pay them over \$1,000 a mile over a fair profit. Why give these railroads a subsidy any more than give ships a subsidy? The ship people claim that they are losing money and can not compete with the cheaper built and cheaper operated foreign ships. But the railroads have not even this claim, and do not pretend to make it as a reason why we should vote them a subsidy of over \$10,000,000 a year. If we are going to vote away the people's money in subsidies by the millions and tens of millions to poor emaciated and starving corporations, I would prefer to vote it to the ships, for they need it most and it might possibly do some good there. The ship people only asked for \$9,000,000.

The Secretary read as follows:

If it be true, as Mr. Bradley states, that the storage capacity of these cars for letters alone is as high as 8,000 pounds, and in some instances 10,000 pounds, it is evident that the earnings are greatly increased when the cars are properly loaded.

Mr. BUTLER. I desire to state in this connection that the estimate of Professor Adams of \$1,178 profit a mile was where there were only 3½ tons in the car, while the evidence shows that the cars carry from 7,000 to 12,000 pounds, and, as the report states, of course as you increase the amount in the car you increase the profit almost in proportion. Therefore this great profit comes

from the slightly loaded car, which carries only 3½ tons. Now, take the roads that carry from 7,000 pounds up to 12,000 pounds in each car and the profit is enormously increased for each mile.

The Secretary read as follows:

Let it be noted also that in making this calculation Professor Adams has taken the average cost per train mile as \$1, though as a matter of fact it is given by the Interstate Commerce Commission as 95½ cents in 1893. Moreover, the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad, which continues to assign its operating expenses between the passenger and freight service, gives its average cost per passenger train per mile as 71 cents, mail trains being classed with passenger trains. Whether the real cost of a mail train on the Pennsylvania Railroad is nearer 71 cents than 95½ cents is an open question. Besides that, Professor Adams's calculation makes no allowance for the decreased service on Sunday, but assumes that the same full service is rendered for the whole 365 days in the year. So it will be seen that Professor Adams has given the road, in his calculation, the benefit of the most favorable conditions in each instance.

Mr. BUTLER. I call attention to this because in the calculation Professor Adams made he did the same thing all the way through. Wherever there was any conflict in the testimony he gave the benefit of the doubt to the railroad. Now, here was conflicting testimony, showing that the cost per passenger train per mile was all the way from 71 cents to 95 cents. What does he do in making his calculation? Does he take 71 cents, the lowest price? No. Does he take an average between 71 cents and 95 cents, which would have been fair? No. Does he take 95 cents, the highest price? No. He puts it at a dollar so as to be way beyond any controversy. He not only does not take the average price given in the testimony, he not only does not take the highest price, but he takes the round sum of a dollar, which is more than anybody claims that it costs per mile for passenger-car service. This is important in that it shows how exceedingly conservative his recommendation must be when he was so extremely liberal to the railroads in every calculation that he made to arrive at his conclusion. The methods he used in making his calculations show conclusively that his recommendation is very much too low.

The Secretary read as follows:

After a most careful and, I think, impartial consideration of this question, I am forced to the conclusion that the present law makes overpayment to the railroads on the dense mail routes, and that the reduction recommended by Professor Adams, ranging from 1 to 12 per cent on weights beyond 5,000 pounds, is reasonable and just.

In presenting the foregoing views, I have considered the regular railway mail pay and the extra postal car pay as one single item of compensation. If the reductions advocated by Professor Adams in the general rates are made, I would not advocate an additional reduction in postal car pay; but if those general reductions are rejected, I think there ought to be a reduction in the postal car pay.

There seems to be some confusion of thought and language in many of the public reports, as well as in the testimony of some of the witnesses before the commission, in reference to the use of postal cars and the basis of pay therefor. A simple statement of facts will clear up the situation. In the days of the stage coach there was, of course, no distribution of mail in transit. When railways were built, the Government promptly availed itself of the better mail facilities afforded by this method of transportation. With the enlarged space at command, it was an easy step to have pigeonholes placed in the apartment of the car allotted to the mail and require the agent in charge to assort the local mail. The arrangement at first was crude, but from this original apartment car, used generally for mail and baggage, there was gradually evolved, especially after 1864, the complete railway post-office car of the present day, which is in reality a traveling post-office for the assortment and distribution of mail.

The post-office records do not show the number of these apartment cars in use prior to 1882, but that they were very generally used for purposes of local distribution at a much earlier period on the railway mail routes is shown by the fact that on April 30, 1859, an order was issued by the Post-Office Department discontinuing 13 of the 150 distributing offices then in existence as being no longer necessary. (History of the Railway Mail Service, p. 78.)

Neither previous to 1873 nor since has the Government ever paid anything extra for these apartment mail cars. They were considered as affording only reasonable facilities for carrying mail, as freight cars were for carrying freight, and passenger cars for carrying passengers. The pay for their use was included in the regular mail rate, just as the pay for using a freight car was included in the freight rate, and the pay for a passenger car in the passenger rate.

That this position is correct is further shown by the fact that the law of 1873, which provides for the first time in our history for extra payment for railway post-office cars, made no provision to pay for any car less than 40 feet in length, while, as a matter of fact, there were no apartment cars in existence then, nor are there any in existence now, with a mail apartment as long as 40 feet.

Mr. BUTLER. The following part of the report for a page or two is devoted to railway postal cars. Inasmuch as that will be a matter for discussion hereafter on another amendment, I ask the Secretary to skip that and to go to page 43, beginning with the second paragraph, commencing "The deficiency in the postal department" and read the conclusion of Mr. FLEMING's minority report.

The Secretary read as follows:

The deficiency of the Postal Department for the decade beginning 1890 has averaged about \$11,000,000 per annum, when the proper debits and credits are allowed. With the probable extension of the pneumatic tube service and rural free delivery there would seem to be no prospect in the early future of reducing this deficit unless some more effective system of economy is adopted by the Department.

The special weightings in the fall of 1890 reveal the fact that 48.40 per cent of the weight of "mail matter" is really the weight of the "equipment," consisting of pouches, sacks, etc. With this definite information in its possession the Department will, no doubt, succeed in reducing hereafter the

percentage of weight of equipment. No wide-awake merchant would pay such a heavy percentage of freight on mere "casing" or "wrapping."

Mr. BUTLER. This is something that no doubt has astonished Senators and the country so far as it has been noticed. The commission find that of the \$34,000,000 or more which we pay now for carrying the mail 48 per cent is not paid for carrying mails, but for carrying mail bags—heavy leather pouches. This must explain why the leather pouches in which letters are carried are so heavy. I have often wondered, in seeing a mail pouch thrown from a train, why the leather was a quarter of an inch or more thick. Apparently they have searched the tanneries of the world to get the heaviest leather to be found. I have wondered why the locks and all the furnishing of a mail bag were so enormously heavy. It would seem that the railroad companies have used their influence to have the mail bags made very heavy, because they get exactly the same pay for hauling a mail bag that they get for hauling a thousand letters that would weigh the same as the bag.

All of the furnishings and equipments of a car, amounting to 48 per cent of the total weight of the mail, are charged up and paid for now by weight just as we pay for letters by weight. In other words, 51.60 per cent only of the money we pay now for carrying the mails is paid for carrying the mails. Forty-eight per cent is for bags and other equipments. There would be just as much sense in weighing the car and paying for the weight of the car. There would be just as much sense in a railroad charging a man, in shipping his cotton, for the truck that they might put in the car for the convenience of loading and unloading, if they needed one, or for anything else, or if they put an iron poker or a hand spike in the car to weigh that up and charge it to the man who shipped the cotton.

Mr. President, we do worse than that. After doing all this, paying for the weight of the mail bags, and paying for all the equipment inside of the car at the same rate we pay for mail, we turn around and pay for the car in rent for one year more than it cost to build the car. So this pays them better than if we were to weigh the whole car and pay for the car by weight.

The Secretary read as follows:

I do not hold that the railroads ought to be arbitrarily assessed to make up the postal deficit or any part of it, but I do think that under existing conditions the roads, especially on the dense routes, are being paid more for the carriage of mail than they are justly entitled to, and that a proper rate of pay would to some extent lessen this deficiency.

The moderate reductions suggested could not seriously jeopardize the railroad interests of the country, as the mail pay constituted in 1898 only 2.74 per cent of the total earnings of the roads (Part II, p. 219). Both reductions together would save to the Government about \$4,000,000 per annum, according to Professor Adams's estimate. This sum would be less than one-twentieth of 1 per cent of the annual gross earnings of the roads.

We have undoubtedly a most excellent postal system, but we also have a most costly one. The total expenditures for the year ending June 30, 1900, as taken from the report of the Postmaster-General, were \$107,249,208.13, of which \$7,123,277.27 were expended for railway transportation.

We alone, of all the leading nations of the world, show a deficit in postal operations. Whether the expenses of the Post-Office Department are paid from sales of postage stamps or from funds raised by general taxation, the burden of payment in either case is borne by the people. But there would be more equity in a system of properly adjusted stamp prices to be paid by those who use the stamps than there is in the present system of national taxation for supplying the General Treasury. Under that national system wealth, as such, is not directly taxed at all, and the multimillionaire pays no more to support the Federal Government, which in part protects his vast estate, than does the citizen of small estate, whose food, clothing, shelter, etc., are of the like quality and quantity.

In my judgment good business policy requires that we should endeavor to adjust our rates of postage and our expenditures in such manner as to make the Post-Office Department substantially self-supporting.

WM. H. FLEMING.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], also a member of the commission, concurs in the minority report of Mr. FLEMING. He concurs in a separate report. It is worth reading, for it has a great deal more in it than the report of the commission.

But I will not ask for the reading of Mr. CHANDLER's report. The Senator is present, and I suppose he will want to be heard on the pending amendment, and it would be much more refreshing to the Senate to have it in his inimitable and interesting style from the Senator's lips than to have it read. I hope we shall have the pleasure of hearing the Senator in person, so I will not ask for the reading of his report, as valuable as it is.

Mr. President, I will turn now to the report of the majority of the commission. The report begins as follows:

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE THE POSTAL SERVICE.

The undersigned, members of the commission appointed by act of Congress approved June 13, 1898.

So that is three years we have been investigating it, and after three years of investigation and an enormous amount of testimony taken the commission does not even summarize the testimony. In short, the commission has left it so that each Senator who desires to know the weight of testimony on either side must delve through these volumes for himself. I see no sense in appointing a commission to investigate a great controverted question if that commission will not digest the evidence on both sides and present it in its report, so that Senators and the country can intelligently

follow the commission to its conclusions and use their own judgment to decide whether they concur in the conclusions found.

I suppose that was not done because the commission was hurried so. It was appointed to report in one year. We extended the time to two years, and then to three years, and yet they did not digest this testimony. Surely the members of the commission, men of experience and ability, understood thoroughly that that was the duty of a commission or committee appointed to investigate any question. Therefore there can be but one of two explanations for their failure to digest this testimony in their report. They either did not have time in three years to do it, or else the conclusion which the majority reached would look absurd at the end of a digest of the facts. Therefore it would not look well to fairly digest the testimony and give both sides and then draw a conclusion which was in opposition to what the facts would justify. I prefer to believe that they did not have the time; and if that is the case, as much as I have objected to running this matter over three years, I will say to the Senator from Iowa he ought to have frankly come in here again and told us that the commission needed another year.

Before proceeding to analyze a part of the report, I think it will not be improper to say in this connection that the commission was appointed because the facts furnished us officially, as well as other facts unofficially, but well substantiated, taken from the census report and taken from various sources, showed that there should be a reduction of at least 25 per cent.

The commission was appointed to try to prove that these facts were not correct. Now, if it was the purpose of those desiring the commission to be appointed to get the facts and give them to the Senate, it is a strange thing that no man was put on the commission who had in the past investigated this matter and presented the facts to Congress that caused the commission to be appointed.

I should have regretted very much myself to have had to give the time and labor to serve on the commission, and I did not desire it; but there is the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW], who has investigated this matter diligently and thoroughly for many years. A large commission is appointed, and he is left off.

The commission is stocked and filled up with Senators and members of the House of Representatives if not all an overwhelming majority of whom had never given the matter any attention or who had time and again expressed the opinion that there ought not to be any reduction. I think at the time the commission was appointed not a single man appointed had ever given any especial attention or investigation to the subject.

Therefore I trust I can be pardoned for saying that the commission was appointed to try to find some excuse for not making any reduction and that it began its work prejudiced against any reduction, and surely the majority of the commission in its report does not consider or refer to any of the testimony except that opposed to a reduction. On page 5 of their report they say:

Owing to intimations from various sources that some knowledge of the postal service of Great Britain and of the leading countries of continental Europe would be of valuable assistance, the commission sent one of its members, accompanied by a postal official detailed by the Department, to Europe, who investigated the postal services of several of the leading nations.

Why, did not the commission know that that had already been done? Did the commission send one of its members to Europe because they were not satisfied with the investigation made by Second Assistant Postmaster-General Shallenberger? He went to Europe and made an investigation under the direction of the Department, and here is his report in House Document No. 4, Fifty-fifth Congress. The commission certainly were familiar with that report. Evidently they were not pleased with the finding of facts made by Mr. Shallenberger.

Mr. Shallenberger has always been considered very friendly to the railroads, if not extremely partial to them. Nobody has ever accused him of being the least unfriendly to anything that could be called a railroad. I think he even has an affectionate feeling for a toy train in a store window when he passes along the street. Yet with his prejudices, if he has any, in favor of the railroads, he made a report of the conditions in Europe that showed that we pay more for some service than any European country. So it seems that he admitted too much; that he told too many truths; that he stated facts he could not explain away; and so the commission had to send one of its members to Europe that would give us less facts.

Now, what did Mr. Shallenberger's report show? He shows in his report that in many European countries the Governments require every road and every train that is run on every road to carry one mail car free. They say that the roads have great and important privileges; they have a monopoly of passenger and freight business; they have great protection from the Government, and enjoy special privileges, and therefore the Government calls upon them to carry one car on every train for mail and to carry it free. The Government does not pay any rent for the car and it does not pay a cent for the mail that goes in it, and it is only when it requires more than one car to go that it pays anything. When an

extra car is put on, or if the whole train is required to be run for mail, as they do in France and in many cases in Great Britain, then they pay so much for the train. But they pay there less for that extra service than we pay for the gross service here. In France and Great Britain they have regular engines and full trains of cars used exclusively for mail.

What does this report of Mr. Shallenberger show? It shows that when a full train is run for mail and nothing else the Government pays only 85 cents for the whole train per mile, while here we pay 25 cents on just one car.

Mr. President, this is a very interesting report. I have gone through it in part. I intended to read from it at length, but I will take for the present only a few extracts. For instance, I read now from the report on France. Mr. Shallenberger says:

The conditions of the postal service in France are very different from those prevailing in the United States, and are somewhat unique.

The Government control of railways has always been such as to secure substantially free transportation for mails. When the Government sanctioned the building of railways and granted franchises, it was with the understanding that mails should be carried free as a consideration. Hence it is that the Government has reserved the right to send out one full mail train each day on every railway running out of Paris.

Now, unfortunately, we did not reserve that right in this country. But is that any reason why we should pay an enormous price for carrying the mail above a fair profit? Suppose the French Government had not been wise enough to reserve the right, as a condition in granting charters for railroads, that they should carry the mail free, would anyone say to-day, simply because the Government was not wise enough to do it, that the Government of France ought to pay an extortionate price for carrying the mail?

Mr. President, while we did not reserve that right, yet it would not be any more hardship to the railroads in this country to-day than it is to the railroads of France if the Government should say to every railroad in the country, "You must carry a car free on every train and carry the mails in it free for the Government." It would not bankrupt them. They would be as well off as the French and English railroads, and better, and make more money. The great privileges that they enjoy would justify them in carrying the mails for the Government free. And yet here we are, after three years of investigation, paying \$34,000,000 out of the \$100,000,000 that the Post-Office Department costs for carrying mails, and we are quibbling about a reduction of 5 per cent when there has not been a cent reduction in the twenty-three years in mail pay, although there has been an enormous reduction in everything else.

Mr. President, in Germany the Government even requires the railroads to build suitable mail depots for the convenience of the Government free of charge, and suitable residences for the mail employees near the depots. Here is one section of the report, which reads as follows:

If there are no suitable private residences in the neighborhood of depots, the railway companies are bound, in preparing plans for depots or stations or for enlarging stations, to have suitable regard for living rooms for the postal officials.

Mr. DEPEW. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. DEPEW. Does the report show what wages are paid for the same class of labor on railways in Germany, compared with the wages paid in the United States?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not think it does. It makes a comparison as to the profits of the roads for carrying mails there and carrying them here.

Mr. DEPEW. Does it state the rate per ton per mile which agricultural and other character of freight pays in Germany and France compared with the rate per ton per mile paid in the United States?

Mr. BUTLER. He deals entirely with the cost of carrying the mail there and carrying it here and the conveniences of the postal service to the people. He discusses the whole postal question; that is, he went into the question of postal savings banks and parcels posts, and he covered the whole field to show what the people in each country got from the postal service, and its efficiency. He discussed all those questions.

Mr. DEPEW. I made an investigation once of the difference in the rate of wages of the employees of the railways in Continental Europe and in Great Britain compared with the same class of labor on railways in the United States. I found that on the Continent the rate of wages would not average over one-quarter what is paid by the railways in the United States for the same labor and the same rank of service, and that the rate per ton per mile for cereals and freight of that character was about one-quarter in the United States what it is upon the Continent of Europe.

Mr. BUTLER. That may be true, and yet it would not affect in the least the question under consideration, because, as I have just stated, those roads carry the mails free for the Government. Some roads carry one full mail train each day free, as France requires; others carry one car free. Nearly every country requires

either all or a part of the mail to be carried free. No matter what their wages, whether high or low, the service is free to the government, while here we are paying a higher rate, regardless of the rate of wages, for mail than the roads charge for passenger and freight service in this country. That is the comparison I was making. Our roads have reduced freight and passenger rates very much, but the Government is paying the same for the mails.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, just one word further.

Mr. BUTLER. In addition to that, take the parcels-post system. An 11-pound package is carried for 12 cents by the post-office department in England, while here we extend no such privileges.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, if the American railways, which average, I think, about 6.6 mills per ton per mile for the carrying of the great products of the farm, charged 2.41 cents, which is the average rate on the Continent of Europe, they could not only carry the mails for nothing, but they could make a present of revenue to the Government. They could do the same if the rate of wages was the same upon our railways—and I am glad to say it is not—as the rate of wages on the railways of Continental Europe.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I interrupt the Senator from North Carolina for a moment?

Mr. BUTLER. In just one moment, if the Senator will pardon me. Does the Senator from New York mean to say that the railways of America are losing money on account of the high prices we pay for labor in carrying freight as low as six-tenths of a cent per ton per mile?

Mr. DEPEW. I do not mean to say that we are losing money, but I do mean to say that if the railroads of the United States had anything like the wage rate or the rate per ton per mile that there is in continental Europe they could carry the mail free and pay a large revenue to the Government in addition.

Mr. BUTLER. There is no pertinency in that suggestion, for this reason: In spite of the fact, as the Senator says, that we pay a much higher rate for wages, our roads still carry the freight at a low rate and make money, and the profits of the American railways are greater than the profits of any of the railways in Europe.

Mr. DEPEW. No.

Mr. BUTLER. But at any rate since mail pay has been reduced a cent freight rates have gone down 44 per cent and passenger rates 21 per cent. This is a fact that the Senator can not deny, and that fact justifies a reduction of mail pay regardless of wages paid; and besides, while the Senator is an expert on railroad questions, yet I insist that unless my memory serves me treacherously there are no railroads in the world that make so large a profit as the American railroads.

Mr. DEPEW. If we take the capitalization of those railroads, which is very much larger than any capitalization we have in this country (I have not the exact figures, but it is very much larger; I think in England it is about \$350,000 per mile), and if you reduce that capitalization to the average capitalization in the United States, their profits are enormous.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it does not make any difference what rate of wages we pay or what we charge for freight. If we are making a good profit at what we carry freight, then it does not alter the question at all, for the freight rate is fixed by the railroad companies, and they are just as able to carry the mails free for this Government as a road in Europe that charges a higher freight rate, for the reason that they pay higher wages or for any other reason. And surely the argument of the Senator, even if it is correct, is no argument against the reduction of railway mail pay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). The Senator from North Carolina will suspend while the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 3717) to make oleomargarine and other imitation dairy products subject to the laws of the State or Territory into which they are transported, and to change the tax on oleomargarine.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside while we finish the pending appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Now, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understood the Senator to say that railroads in Europe carried mails free, or practically so. The facts are that in Great Britain, which is about the size of New England and a part of New York, the cost of mail transportation is little, if any, less than our own, and that in the countries on the Continent of Europe there has either been government ownership of railroads or a government guarantee of the payment of the principal and interest of their bonds and of dividends upon their stock, and as part consideration of that the railroads undertake to fulfill certain functions toward the government, including the carriage of the mails. But there is no free transportation of mails anywhere.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator has not read Mr. Shallenberger's report.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I have.

Mr. BUTLER. Then Mr. Shallenberger is wrong, or has the Senator got better information? I am quoting from an official report.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In what countries are mails carried free?

Mr. BUTLER. In France, for one.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In France the Government owns two or three roads, and guarantees the payment of the principal and interest of the obligations of the others, and in return for that guarantee the roads transport the Government troops, mails, and munitions of war, not absolutely free, but for a consideration.

Mr. BUTLER. They pay for all such service rendered above a certain amount. I find in the report there is more than one country which requires free transportation of mails. In Germany the Government requires every road to carry one mail car free.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. And for every extra car the Government pays so much.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Certainly they do; and in consideration of it the German Empire guarantees the obligations and securities of the railroad companies.

Mr. BUTLER. It is very strange, if that is the explanation, why Mr. Shallenberger did not put it into his report.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is in the report somewhere.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like the Senator to show it to me.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEPEW. I think the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] has about covered the point I desire to make. I do not know about Germany, but in France, in consideration of the Government using the railways for any purposes it pleases and at any time it pleases, the French Government guarantees to the bondholders of the railway the payment of interest on their bonds, and to the stockholders of the railway a dividend, I think, of 6 per cent, or, it may be, 5 per cent, if not greater, on the capital stock.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will say to the Senator from North Carolina that that is in the report. The French Government guarantees 3 per cent, and that it causes the Government of France a deficit of from sixty to seventy millions of francs per year. In Germany the Government owns the railroads.

Mr. BUTLER. But that is not true in Great Britain; and Mr. Shallenberger in his report says that the English Government pays the railroads only 2.4 cents per pound for carrying the mails, while we pay nearly 6 cents per pound.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In the report of Mr. LOUD, who was a member of the Postal Commission and who is chairman of the Post-Office Committee in the other House—

Mr. BUTLER. I thought the Senator was getting the reports mixed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am not getting them mixed. It is in the report.

Mr. BUTLER. In Mr. Shallenberger's report?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; in the report the Senator holds in his hand.

Mr. BUTLER. This is Mr. Shallenberger's report.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is also Mr. LOUD's report. Both are in the same volume.

Mr. BUTLER. I am reading from the special report made by Mr. Shallenberger, when he was sent to Europe by the Postmaster-General to investigate the mail service; and there is no report in it by Mr. LOUD.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. LOUD also made an investigation in Europe, and his report is in the same volume.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. LOUD was sent to England by the Postal Commission to try to explain away the facts furnished by Shallenberger. Now, he says in his official report that mail per pound costs only 2.4 cents in England, while everybody knows that it costs nearly 6 cents per pound here. Can the Senator deny this fact? Did Mr. LOUD succeed in disproving it? Yet I understood the Senator to claim that the mail cost was more there than it is here.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; what I said was, that that was a compact group of islands, only a little larger than New England and a part of New York, and that the mail service there cost little, if any, less than in this country.

Mr. BUTLER. That is no answer; it is begging the question. The Senator compares mail in England with our country, and claims that they pay the railroads more than we do; and when I produce the official facts to show that we pay nearly three times as much, then he says that it is not fair to make a comparison between the two countries. This is a sample of the kind of argument that has always been presented by the opponents of a reduction of mail

pay. When we compared mail pay to freight and express pay, they said that was not fair, but a comparison with passenger rates would be fairer. But when we showed the Government was paying twice as much per pound for mail as the average passenger pays per pound for himself and baggage, then at once they cry that that is not a fair comparison.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator from North Carolina will allow me, I wish to call upon the chairman of the committee for a little more information in regard to the amount of mail pay given by the two Governments of Germany and France in the way of guaranty of the bonds of the railroads.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The German Government, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina, absolutely owns its railroads.

Mr. TILLMAN. All of them?

Mr. WOLCOTT. All of them. The Government has acquired all of them. The Austrian Government owns its railroads.

Mr. TILLMAN. How as to France?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In France the Government owns two—the Orleans and the Sud, I think—and it guarantees the payment of the securities of the others, including the payment of a dividend upon their stock of 3 per cent. The net loss to the French Government on that transaction is, I am informed, from sixty to seventy million francs a year.

Mr. TILLMAN. Would that net loss not be in the nature of compensation for carrying the mail and other Government transportation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Undoubtedly. You see the rights of the Government over the railroads and their guaranties are all so intimately interwoven that it is almost impossible to estimate how much would go for the mails. For instance, the railroads carry munitions of war in France, and with its immense standing army there is constant transportation of troops. All sorts of questions are constantly arising; certain allowances are made by the Government to the railroads for the transportation done, while other transportation is done free. The excess above a certain weight of mail is paid for. But the system there is such that you can not make a comparison of it with that in this country.

Mr. TILLMAN. Is all the French Government pays for its transportation the furnishing of this guaranty to the railroad companies?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, no. It pays enormous sums for other things as well.

Mr. TILLMAN. It has to pay so much a pound for transportation and, in addition, it furnishes the guaranty to which the Senator refers.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It pays in cash for all the mail above a certain weight, and it allows for the cost of certain transportation.

Mr. TILLMAN. So that the 70,000,000 francs does not cover the entire expenditure?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, no; nothing like it.

Mr. TILLMAN. I merely wanted to find out about that point.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he has any evidence to show that Mr. Shallenberger was wrong in his statement that the mails in Europe cost only 2.4 cents a pound as compared with 5.6 cents in the United States? That is in this report.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is in the report, and there are a great many other things in the report which show that England makes separate contracts for different characters of mail. For its parcels mail it makes a separate contract with the railroads, and it makes other contracts for the carriage of other kinds of mail. The first-class mail matter is carried upon a different basis and a different plan. As nearly as you can make a comparison it is a little cheaper than ours; but, as I have said, England is a compact, thickly settled country, with no great sparsely occupied territory as we have in many of our States, and you can not institute a very fair comparison between the two.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, that is the same old dodge. But I understood the Senator to say the other day that the density of traffic did not have much to do with this question.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, no; I did not say that.

Mr. BUTLER. I understood the Senator to say that such was the case; but it makes a difference as to which foot the shoe is on, as to whether or not the evidence is worth anything.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will say to the Senator that the density of traffic would make a very great difference if it were not for the fact that our mail, as I have said so many times before, is carried in postal cars, a 65-foot car, weighing a hundred thousand pounds, which will carry about 3 tons of mail. So that as the density increases the dead weight also increases and the expenditure increases.

Mr. BUTLER. As to dead weight, the testimony shows that there is twice as much dead weight in the passenger service as in the mail service. Also the evidence of the Post-Office Department officials shows that about 6 tons of mail are carried on many of the cars.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, no.

Mr. BUTLER. That is in the testimony, Mr. President.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, no.

Mr. BUTLER. I will read it. The Senator was out when I read it before, I suppose, and I will call his attention to it right now.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I call the attention of the Senator to the testimony of Mr. Bradley, one of the Government officials, who has to do with the Pennsylvania through system, in which he states that the load of a postal car is sometimes 2 tons and sometimes 2½ tons, but the average load is about 2 tons.

Mr. BUTLER. But Mr. Davis, of the Post-Office Department, says that 7,000 pounds, or 3½ tons, is an easy load.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. On what page of the report is that?

Mr. BUTLER. Part second, page 234 of the testimony:

On the other hand, if cars were loaded with 3½ tons, which Mr. Davis says is an "easy load," or should the average load go as high as 6 tons, which, according to testimony, is accomplished on the Pennsylvania Railroad by its special mail train—

Mr. WOLCOTT. Who says that?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Davis, of the Post-Office Department. Mr. Bradley's testimony is here somewhere; and Professor Adams makes a specific calculation of the actual cost of carrying the mail in postal cars over the Pennsylvania road. He takes as his basis 3½ tons, which Mr. Davis, of the Post-Office Department, testified was an easy load. Taking that as a comparison, he finds the profit per mile is \$1,178 for every mile, after every expense has been counted, and 33 per cent taken off for fixed charges and dividends. So it is a clear bonus or subsidy above the dividend.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of course.

Mr. BUTLER. Then he goes on to say that that is taken as an easy load at a very low estimate. Mr. FLEMING, in his minority report, calls attention to that, and goes on to comment on the fact that the testimony shows that that is below the average amount, because many of the postal cars carry from 8,000 to 10,000 pounds.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There are all sorts of testimony taken on the subject. There is no question that 6,000 is an easy load—that is, 3 tons; but the average load, as Mr. Bradley shows, in whose department this business is conducted, is 2 tons, and it is hardly ever any more. You must remember that the west-bound is greater than the east-bound mail. The increase as to difference in time is considerable. The average weight is something over 2 tons, and of that 55 per cent is or has been equipment.

Mr. BUTLER. As to the average we must remember that some roads carry as low as 16 pounds a day, and that they get \$42.75 a year per mile just the same as a road which carries 200 pounds daily. And, as the Senator admits, heavy mail sacks are used, and for them we pay the same rate that we pay for letters.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. They look the world over to find leather a quarter of an inch thick, and then they put on the heaviest locks they can find, so as to double the amount we have to pay.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is not in the interest of the railroads; and the last report of the Department is that they are endeavoring to find better equipment and hope to reduce the weight of the railway mail pay by not putting so much weight into equipment.

Mr. BUTLER. It is in the interest of the roads, for they are paid for every ounce of this weight, the same as if it were mail. The weight of equipment never ought to have got up to what it is.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The railroad has no more to do with the mail bag than it has with an eclipse.

Mr. BUTLER. No; and the railroads have nothing to do with the fixing of this enormous price we are now paying them—no more than they have to do with an eclipse.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Not a bit.

Mr. BUTLER. Not a particle; and we are now trying to look after them, to protect their interests, and see that they are not robbed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. BUTLER. And they have nothing in the world to do with it. We should consider ourselves as their special guardians; and we will. The fact is that if the railroads did not own and run the Government we would pay them no more for carrying the mail than we pay for the star-route service, which is only about five millions for the whole country.

Mr. President, all there is in this majority report is an effort to try to explain away why you can not compare the pay for the mail with the pay for freight, with the pay for passenger service, or with the pay for express service.

When the commission began to investigate the matter they found that the facts which had been presented about the comparison between railway-mail pay and express pay were correct, so far as deductions are concerned. They could find no flaw in the logic; and so they went to work to discredit the facts, and they got witnesses to say that the census report was wrong. Then they got the witnesses to attack the Government report—the report of the Post-Office Department—and say that the average distance of the haul was wrong. So they go to work and conclude that all the facts

before given were wrong; but they did not succeed in their effort, in my opinion, and it is their effort to try to sustain their contention, which Professor Adams, their own expert, does not agree with.

The National Board of Trade is a body of people very much interested in the transportation question, and a body of people who have intimate relations with the transportation lines of the country. They have taken an interest in this matter for several reasons. It is well known that the merchants and business men of the country want 1-cent letter postage, and they feel that a reduction of postage to 1 cent would soon bring as much revenue to the Government as 2-cent postage, on account of increased business. For a number of years the National Board of Trade passed resolutions petitioning Congress to give them 1-cent letter postage. They were always met with the suggestion that there is now a deficit, and that they could not get it until the deficit was removed. This caused the National Board of Trade to appoint a special committee to investigate the causes of the postal deficit, their interest primarily being to get 1-cent letter postage if some way could be found to prevent the deficit.

What was the result of the investigation of these business men through their select committee? They had no more idea when they began the investigation that the railway mail pay was too high than the distinguished chairman of the committee, who still believes it is not too high. They were not looking for economies in that direction. They began by investigating what are called abuses in second-class mail matter. A certain Representative, who has given a great deal of attention to that subject, had industriously called their attention and the attention of the country to the fact that that was the great abuse in the Post-Office Department causing the deficit. So they proceeded to investigate that question. But, having started on the investigation, they did not stop, and they soon found that the railway mail pay was too high. Then they appointed a special committee to investigate that matter, and the investigation of these business men, who are friendly with the railroads and have intimate business relations with them, has been going on for years.

Several very able reports have been made by that committee to the full annual meeting of the Board of Trade. The chairman of that subcommittee representing the Board of Trade appeared before the Postal Commission, and I think I am correct when I say his facts so staggered the commission when he proved that there ought to be a 25 per cent reduction, that then they went searching for Professor Adams to help them out of the difficulty. Professor Adams was put to work dissecting the facts presented by the National Board of Trade, and he did all in his power, it seems, to explain them away; but having completely failed to do it, he did recommend a slight reduction.

Since the Postal Commission has made its report this same committee of the National Board of Trade have continued their investigations. They considered the reduction of railway mail pay in connection with 1 cent letter postage and a parcels-post system. They have continued their investigations to the point of examining the report and making a report on the report, in which they say in part:

REPORT OF THE POSTAL COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL BOARD OF TRADE.

Mr. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN: In view of the very exhaustive report made at our last meeting, and to which you gave such patient attention, we will endeavor in this report to be as brief and concise as is consistent with a clear and rational understanding of the subjects in which the board has taken such keen interest and which have awakened such widespread attention, particularly among commercial organizations.

Third. In regard to a cheap parcels post system:

House bill No. 6066, introduced by Mr. HENRY (by request), provides the following rates: Parcels weighing up to a half pound, 1 cent; from one-half pound to 5 pounds, 5 cents; from 5 pounds to 11 pounds, 10 cents; from 11 pounds to 30 pounds, 15 cents; from 30 pounds to 60 pounds, 20 cents; and on larger parcels up to 200 pounds, for each additional 20 pounds weight, 5 cents.

Senate bill No. 1030, relating to the same matter, was also introduced into the Senate by Senator Pettigrew, which provides for the following rates: Parcels up to 1 pound, 8 cents; parcels over 1 and up to 5 pounds, 5 cents; parcels over 5 and up to 10 pounds, 10 cents; parcels over 10 and up to 30 pounds, 30 cents; parcels over 30 and up to 60 pounds, 20 cents.

It will be noticed from the above figures that large packages could be sent through the mail at as low a rate as one-third of a cent per pound, although the average rate paid for the railroad transportation of mail the length of the average distance is now estimated to be about 2½ cents per pound for mail and equipment, or probably 5 cents per pound for mail exclusive of equipment, which cost is exclusive of other postal expenses.

It should also be borne in mind that at the rate of 1 cent per pound for second-class matter the actual loss to the Department has been computed at over \$35,000,000 per annum.

The above pertinent facts suggest the following deductions:

a. The adoption of the rates quoted in the above bills would entail, under existing conditions, such an alarming loss to the Department as to preclude their serious consideration at this time.

b. A vital connection exists between railway mail pay and parcel post rates, for the reason that the actual cost of the former must be provided for in counting the practicable rates for the latter.

c. It is doubtful if any more advanced step toward the adoption of a cheap parcels post system can be safely taken at this time than the mere merging of third and fourth class matter into one class at a uniform rate of 8 cents per pound, and even this would probably result in some loss to the Government.

d. Inasmuch as the railroad cost of transportation is a vital factor in the

cost of the transmission of merchandise, and as the estimated costs of 2½ cents and 5 cents per pound are based upon an average 438-mile haul, it might be necessary to charge proportionate zone rates for every 500 or 1,000 miles to save the Government from loss, especially if the increased business in merchandise should consist mainly of long hauls.

It is evident that the subject of a cheap parcels post system, although familiar to those in Great Britain and other European countries, has not yet received in this country the thorough and scientific investigation which Americans have shown in nearly every other branch of commercial utility.

Fourth. Regarding the question of railway mail pay:

We beg to report that the chairman of your committee was again summoned on April 20, 1900, to appear before the Joint Congressional Commission to Investigate Railway Mail Pay and cross examined for nearly five hours. This lengthy cross-examination, which involved some technical questions regarding railroads which your chairman made no pretension of being familiar with, led, substantially, to a fuller explanation and elaboration of the former testimony. Mr. N. B. Kelly, the freight commissioner of the Trades League, was also present at the examination, and upon request kindly explained some details of railroad operations.

At this hearing your chairman also called attention to the very startling disclosures contained in the report of the special weighing of the mails made in the fall of 1899. The result of this weighing showed that the weight of the equipment in railway mail was found to be almost as great as the weight of the mail itself. In other words, the Government paid approximately \$18,000,000 for the railroad transportation of mail and about \$17,000,000 for the transportation of sacks, pouches, and other forms of equipment.

It was suggested at the time that every effort should be made to lessen the weight of the equipment, and it is gratifying to note in the report of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General that the Department has not only decreased the weight of many sacks or pouches, but has also arranged to have many sacks shipped in full cars as ordinary freight instead of having them included in the weight of the mail as formerly, and for which regular railway-mail rates were paid.

But the most important recent event in connection with railway-mail pay has been the printed report of the joint Congressional commission published within the past week.

In view of the possible misleading impressions gained through the condensed newspaper reports, and in view of the keen interest which the National Board of Trade has taken in the subject, we think it wise to give a very concise but comprehensive review of this report.

The commission was appointed June 13, 1898—over two years and a half ago—and probably no commission has ever assembled during whose deliberations so many official statistics, so many deductions based upon those statistics, and so many honest opinions expressed on both sides of the question, had to be modified in consequence of more recent and scientific analysis.

Four separate reports were made, the first and most elaborate being signed by Senators WOLCOTT and ALLISON.

This report reviewed the appointment of the commission and its work, and calls attention to the following points:

First. That although no modification of the law had been made since 1878, the increased tonnage had automatically reduced the average rate per ton of railway-mail pay.

Second. That the Post-Office Department is very exacting in demanding from the railroad companies unusual service as to frequency of shipment and other conveniences to expedite the prompt carriage of the mail.

Third. That the rate of pay should be reached, "as near as may be, upon a business basis and in accordance with the principles which control ordinary business transactions between private individuals."

Fourth. That the mail is not comparable with the express business.

Fifth. That the mail is not comparable with freight.

Sixth. That "there are too many points of difference between passenger and mail transportation to take the passenger service of the railroads as a basis for the determination of the railway-mail pay."

Seventh. That "the safest method by which to reach a just approximation or estimate of cost to the railroads of transporting the mails" is that which Professor Adams denominates the "method by analysis," by which the expenses and revenues of the freight and passenger departments are segregated, after which the passenger expenses and revenues are also segregated into, "first, the transportation of passengers, including baggage; second, the transportation of express matter," and presumably (although not so stated in the report), third, the transportation of mail.

Eighth. That "space" should not be substituted as the unit for pay in place of the "ton-mile" basis.

Ninth. That although Professor Adams recommended a small reduction in railway-mail pay, he admitted that his conclusions were false if he "proved that it is not possible to introduce greater economies in the Railway Mail Service than now exist."

Tenth. That the reduction in freight rates is mainly due to the increased carrying capacity of the cars as compared with the weight of the car itself; while the history of the mail car regarding comparative weight is reversed.

Eleventh. That on account of the frequency of the service it is impossible to concentrate the mail, and consequently impossible for the railroads to effect the economies theoretically suggested by "density of traffic."

Twelfth. The prices now paid to the railroad companies for the "transportation of the mails are not excessive, and no reduction should be made at this time."

Thirteenth. That on account of the great proportion of "dead" to "paying" weight of railway post-office cars, and their elaborate fittings, etc., no reduction should be made so long as the methods, conditions, and requirements of the postal service continue the same as at present; nor do they recommend the Government ownership of post-office cars.

Fourteenth. They recommend the discontinuance of the appropriations for special postal facilities.

The above report is concurred in by Hon. THOMAS S. MARTIN, with the exception of the last clause.

The second report is signed by Hon. E. F. LOUD, who says "the testimony and deductions therefore lead me to conclude that, as a whole, the railroad companies do not derive a profit from the carriage of mails," but he recommends the substitution of space as a unit for pay in place of weight and partial space.

The third report is prepared by Mr. MOODY, who gives an interesting account of the modifications from time to time of post-office statistics; pays a high tribute to the intelligent work of Professor Adams; calls attention to the fact that 48 per cent of our expenditures to the railroad companies is for the transportation of "equipment," and recommends a continuance of the investigation by a commission of experts. While concurring, otherwise, with the first report, he reaches the following conclusions:

First. The railway-mail pay is not grossly excessive.

Second. If the mail is loaded in the proportion of paying freight to dead weight, which is claimed, then it is not excessive at all.

Third. There is an uncertainty as to the proportion of paying freight to dead weight, which should be removed by investigation.

Fourth. An effort should be made to modify existing methods so that savings may be made without injustice to the carrier.

The above report was concurred in by Hon. T. C. CATCHINGS, except as it approved the discontinuance of the special appropriation for postal facilities. The fourth report was made by Hon. WILLIAM H. FLEMING, and is substantially embodied in the following concise summary:

First. Favors discontinuance of special-facilities appropriation.

Second. Favors correction of abuses connected with second class matter.

Third. Favors reduction in the rate of pneumatic-tube service.

Fourth. Favors Professor Adams's recommendation of reduction in railway-mail pay from 5 to 12 per cent, and states: "The majority of the commission state in their report that 'this question (of mail pay) is one of judgment,' but after making this admission they forthwith proceed to set aside the deliberate judgment of the best expert they could procure."

Fifth. Makes a comparison of the cost of coal and iron between 1873 and 1899 and asks the question, "Is mail transportation entitled to no benefit at all from such sweeping reductions in the cost of operations?"

Sixth. Claims that in 1898 a given amount of freight was moved at 44 per cent less than in 1878; that while the average mail rate was reduced from 20.59 cents per ton per mile to 12.56 cents per ton per mile between the years 1881 and 1898, this reduction was due entirely to the increased weight of mail carried over the particular road that received the payment. The form of the law has not been changed since 1878, and the railroad carrying 100,000 pounds in 1900 receives exactly the same pay that was received in 1879 by a road which carried the same weight of 100,000 pounds.

Seventh. Claims that although some witnesses give the average weight of mail in a postal car as 4,000 pounds, other witnesses testified to the carrying of 7,000, 10,000, and as high as 12,000 pounds.

Eighth. Claims that according to one of Professor Adams's analysis of an important railroad, that \$1,178 per mile was earned by the mail service in excess of its full allowance for expenses and profits.

Ninth. If no reduction be made in railway mail pay he recommends a reduction in the rate paid for post-office cars for the following reasons:

a. If post-office cars were not used the railroad companies would be obliged to furnish and use the regular apartment cars for which no rental has ever been charged.

b. The only equitable amount which the Government should pay for the use of post-office cars when used in place of apartment cars (which they would otherwise be obliged to furnish) is the interest upon the difference in the cost of the two styles of cars; the increased loss by depreciation; the increased cost of fuel for hauling an increased weight; and any increased cost of maintenance.

c. The average annual rental of a post-office car is \$5,703; which is considerably more than the entire cost of the average post-office car, and a generous allowance for the above enumerated items would not exceed \$2,000.

Tenth. As a matter of equity either the rental of post-office cars should be reduced or a rental allowed for apartment cars.

Eleventh. If post-office employees travel as passengers in passenger cars they should pay reasonable fare.

Twelfth. Calls attention to the excessive weight of equipment and recommends reduction in weight.

Thirteenth. Recommends such adjustment as will make the Post-Office Department substantially self-supporting.

The committee of the National Board of Trade then say:

In fairly considering the report—

That is, the report of the Postal Commission—

it must be borne in mind that this commission devoted over two years and a half to the careful study of this problem; that it was authorized to employ experts to aid in the work of inquiry and examination; also to employ a clerk and stenographer and such other clerical assistance as may be necessary. It endeavored to avail itself of every source of information or suggestion which promised to afford anything of value in reaching a just determination of the questions submitted, and held sessions in San Francisco, Chicago, Boston, New York, and Washington. It sent one of its members to study the postal service of Great Britain and the leading countries of continental Europe; employed Prof. Henry C. Adams as an expert; took over 2,000 pages of testimony, and, according to the statement contained in the first or majority report, "the commission feels that it has exhausted every source of information which was open to it within the time at its disposal; that it has obtained evidence of all the available facts bearing upon the question," and that "it has further had the benefit of, and considered all the indirect evidence, suggestions, and arguments which can aid in reaching a just and reliable determination of the question as to the excessiveness or fairness of the compensation now paid the railroads for the transportation of the mails."

Considering that two years and a half were devoted to this work, and that the commission had unlimited resources and facilities for making an exhaustive, profound, and scientific investigation of the subject; and that the members of the commission had previously distinguished themselves for marked ability, it was but natural for those interested in the subject to look forward with keen interest for their final report, with the confident expectation that it would throw such clear light upon, and furnish such a satisfactory solution to, this mooted problem as would be commensurate with the vast amount of time, labor, and money expended, and with the intellectual and judicial acumen of its distinguished members.

That is a very fair statement of the view of the business people of the country. It is what they had a right to expect. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] nods approval. He must think that it is said in commendation of the report of the Postal Commission; but this is a statement of what we had a right to expect. I am glad if the Senator, understanding the meaning of the language I have read, nods approval, and agrees that we had a right to expect that kind of a report. What I am reading does not describe the report that the commission made, but what it ought to have made, and this body of business men say that they and everybody had a right to expect that kind of a report, but did not get it. The report continues:

It was also hoped that the report would not only summarize the strongest points of the railroad testimony, but would also summarize the principal arguments of the other side—

They did not do it—

and then logically and impartially demonstrate the soundness or fallacy of each principal point—

They did not do it—

so that the report would be accepted as being so eminently fair and just to both sides, and the conclusions so comprehensive, logical, consistent, and rational, that all fair-minded men would willingly accept the verdict and consider the question determined beyond further controversy.

They did not make such a report. Therefore, fair-minded men, as this report says, who wanted to hear both sides can not accept the conclusions. This body of business men say they can not accept the conclusions of the commission, because the commission has not given us such a report as business men had a right to expect and ought to have expected from this commission. They say they ought to have the facts summarized on both sides; that the testimony ought not only to have been brought out on both sides, but summarized on both sides, so that every man could intelligently draw his own conclusions. They did not do it.

Mr. SPOONER. May I ask the Senator from North Carolina from what he is reading?

Mr. BUTLER. I am reading from a report adopted by the National Board of Trade, which was prepared by a special subcommittee which that body had appointed to investigate this question of railway-mail pay. Mr. Acker, a prominent merchant of Philadelphia, and well known, was chairman of that subcommittee. He appeared before the Postal Commission. He has also appeared before the Senate Post-Office Committee in the past when we have been considering these questions. He became interested, as I said a moment ago, by being appointed on a subcommittee to work for one-cent letter postage, and the subcommittee reported to the full Board of Trade that they never could get one-cent letter postage until the postal deficit was wiped out, and that they had to search for the cause of the deficit.

The National Board of Trade instructed their subcommittee during the next year to investigate the cause of the deficit, and they have been at that for years. They first investigated the so-called abuse of second-class mail matter, which a member of the House has given a great deal of time to, and what is called the Loud bill has been introduced to correct that alleged abuse, a bill, by the way, which I consider a very bad and dangerous measure, and one which I had the honor of defeating more than once. The committee found that the so-called abuse of second-class mail matter did not explain the deficit; and while investigating it they took up the question of railway mail pay, and then they reported at the next meeting that they were satisfied there could be a great saving if a proper reduction was made in railway mail pay. The committee was instructed another year to work over the matter and bring in something definite and tangible. While that was going on this Postal Commission was appointed, and Mr. Acker, chairman of the committee, was summoned before it and gave his testimony.

He made his report at the next meeting of the Board of Trade, giving facts and figures to show that there ought to be a 25 per cent reduction in railway mail pay. He gives the same testimony to this commission, but this commission reports that there should not be any reduction.

Then this committee of the National Board of Trade proceeded to investigate the report of the commission and to make a report to the National Board of Trade, which met here in Washington the other day; and this is their view of the testimony and the report that we now have before us. This work was intelligently done. It is a very strong, clear, and conservative statement, and one that deserves the attention of the Senate and the country, adopted unanimously, I think, by the National Board of Trade.

Mr. ALLISON. Is the paper from which the Senator is reading in print?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know. This was sent to me by Mr. Acker as a carbon copy of what was adopted by the National Board of Trade the very day the board passed it here in Washington.

Mr. ALLISON. Of course that is nothing but Mr. Acker's view.

Mr. BUTLER. It was adopted by the National Board of Trade, and Mr. Acker furnished me a copy of it the day it was adopted.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. Acker was undoubtedly satisfied with the report.

Mr. BUTLER. It is clear he was, and he convinced the National Board of Trade by facts and figures that there ought to be a 25 per cent reduction, and they declared for the 25 per cent reduction before this commission was appointed. He went before the Postal Commission with the same facts and other facts. He was cross-examined—severely cross-examined, I might say—and every effort to break down his testimony was made, and when every effort failed, Professor Adams was employed to attack his testimony. He proceeded to analyze it and attack it in every possible way, and explain away as much of it as possible. Professor Adams failed to get away with all of it, as he, himself, confessed, and so he recommended a slight reduction.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not want to prolong this debate, but Professor Adams was not employed to attack anything or anybody. He was employed as an expert, and gave faithful and intelligent and long, continuous labor to the work.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, Mr. President, of course I accept the statement of the Senator from Iowa; but from what I know about the time Professor Adams was employed and the time this testimony of Mr. Acker was put before the commission, I thought I

was justified in saying that the commission realized that it needed some help when Mr. Acker got through his testimony.

Mr. ALLISON. The commission was authorized to employ experts.

Mr. BUTLER. But the commission had not employed Professor Adams until after Mr. Acker had produced his testimony and the commission had failed to break him down on cross-examination or to disprove his facts.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not remember as to that. I only want to state that Mr. Acker's testimony had no relation whatever to the employment of Professor Adams, and Professor Adams's employment had no relation to Mr. Acker. So I do not very well see how the two could be connected.

Mr. BUTLER. I had understood differently, and I thought from reliable source; but I accept the Senator's statement, for it is not material. Mr. Adams did analyze and dissect this evidence most exhaustively. He did it minutely, painstakingly, and he had to admit that he could not explain it all away. He did find some errors, but the commission had to attack the official report of the Post-Office Department and say it was wrong. You had to attack the report of the census and say that those figures were wrong, and after doing that you did not explain it all away.

Mr. SPOONER. What action did the National Board of Trade take on this subject?

Mr. BUTLER. They adopted this report, which recommends a larger reduction than Professor Adams recommends. They say they think there ought to be a larger reduction, but they hope at least that Professor Adams's reduction, which is included in my amendment, will be adopted.

Mr. SPOONER. What was the action of the board of trade on the Loud bill?

Mr. BUTLER. I think they indorsed it.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator does not agree to that.

Mr. BUTLER. No; I do not agree to it, and I can give my reasons for not agreeing to it the same as I do for agreeing to this report. I think each action of any man or of any body of men should stand on its own merits.

Mr. SPOONER. Of course. I did not know what their action was. I did not remember, at least.

Mr. BUTLER. I will say to the Senator that they have never given anything like the attention to that question that they have to this, because they had only begun to investigate the second-class matter when they got onto this, and since that time, if you will take the report that is made by the subcommittee of the National Board of Trade, you will find there has been ten times more space devoted to the railway-mail pay than to any other question, showing conclusively that they consider this the great evil causing the deficit in the Post-Office Department. Here is this whole report, and all of it but a page or two is devoted to railway-mail pay. They refer incidentally in the report to second-class matter and 1-cent letter postage, but the thing to which the report is devoted and the remedy asked is a reduction of railway-mail pay. Now, continuing, the report says:

Whether the first or majority report fulfills this expectation we will leave to the judgment of those who will take the trouble to read the report in its entirety, which we earnestly recommend all to do.

Inasmuch as the chairman of our committee has always been treated by the commission with such uniform courtesy and consideration, and as he cherishes so high a personal regard for each member of the commission, he prefers to believe that the majority report was finally prepared or completed under such pressure as to fail to do justice to the unquestioned ability of its signers.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that as courteous as the language is there could not be a stronger indictment, in fact, of the conclusion of the commission than that by this body of business men, in contrasting the facts contained in the testimony, being in contradiction to the findings of the commission and justifying a different finding. Continuing, the report says:

For reasons of personal delicacy we would prefer not to publicly analyze it, but our duty as a committee requires us to at least propound the following pertinent queries:

First. The testimony shows that the reduction in the average price per ton of freight during the past twenty years was at least partially due to a reduction in the freight rates for similar articles in 100-pound lots and also in carload lots. In the case of the reduction in the average earnings per mile for passengers, it is obvious that this reduction must have been substantially for the same service, although rendered to-day in a much more luxurious manner.

There is the query:

Inasmuch as railway-mail pay for 200-pound lots, or for 1,000-pound lots, or for 100,000-pound lots is exactly the same to-day as it was twenty years ago for 200-pound or 1,000-pound or 100,000-pound lots, do not these undisputed facts justify grave doubts as to the soundness of the "automatic reduction" theory, as advanced in the majority report, and also verify the claim that in every instance where a reduction has been made in railway-mail pay that reduction has been due wholly and exclusively to the hauling of a larger quantity of mail, or the conduct of a wholesale instead of a retail operation; on the same principle that the average rate for freight would show an apparent reduction if merchants shipped a larger proportion of merchandise in full carloads, even though not a single reduction were made in the respective rates?

There is a query, a question put to this commission by the National Board of Trade, which can be answered but in one way.

There is not a member of the commission who will undertake to answer that question, because the answer to it is that we are paying the same to-day without any reduction that we did in 1878, while everything else has been reduced, and therefore common sense shows that some reduction is demanded by justice. The second query is:

The "frequency of the mail service" is quoted in the majority report as one reason why a reduction in pay can not be made.

I call attention to the fact that the chairman of the committee made that point as one of his reasons for opposing a reduction a few moments ago before he left the Chamber. What does the board of trade say in answer to that? They say:

Is the frequency of the mail service any greater than the frequency of the "ordinary passenger" or the "commutation passenger" service?

The question suggests its own answer, and the answer is conclusive.

The majority report attributes the reduction in freight rates largely to the lessened ratio of "dead" to "paying load," while in the mail business the ratio of "dead" to "paying load" has increased.

Is that true? The National Board of Trade put this question to the commission:

Has not the ratio of "dead" to "paying load" of passenger service also increased during the past twenty years? Did not President Spencer, of the Southern Railway Company, in his sworn statement before the commission, testify that the ratio of "dead load" to "paying load" was only 15 x to 1 in the case of mail and 31 x to 1 in the case of passengers, thereby making the ratio of "dead load" in the passenger service over 100 per cent greater than in the mail service? Have not the reduced prices of coal and iron, the increased pulling power of locomotives, and the increased average efficiency of operatives during the past twenty years had something to do with the reduction in freight and passenger rates?

Unquestionably the testimony shows that, although the commission refused to refer to it in their report:

The majority report is adverse to any reduction in the present allowance for post-office cars partly because of the large ratio of "dead" to paying load.

Fourth query. Taking the very heaviest weight of any known post-office car and the lightest average weight of mail ever carried in the same car, is not the ratio of "dead" to "paying load" still less than the ratio sworn to by President Spencer on page 680, part 1, of the testimony as existing in the average passenger service?

In computing the ratio of "dead" to "paying load," President Spencer allowed 250 pounds for the weight of the average passenger and baggage. Had he allowed only 200 pounds, according to other evidence, or had he allowed only between 150 and 160 pounds, according to certain subsequent railroad evidence, would not his ratio of "dead" to "paying load" in the passenger service be even as great as 50 to 1?

Even though an excessive ratio of "dead" to "paying load" in the mail service could be indisputably established, what other items in the 32 items of railroad expenditures would be affected by reason of this increased weight other than the two items of coal and water?

Did Vice-President Kruttschnitt, of the Southern Pacific Railway Company, testify before the commission that he voluntarily added, without any additional compensation, 25 per cent to the length of seven lines of new post-office cars they built that year, making an additional weight of from 10,000 to 15,000 pounds on each car and an annual additional haul of millions of ton-miles?

Would Mr. Kruttschnitt have added this 25 per cent weight and hauled these millions of ton-miles because of his dislike to "build a back-number car" if he had not believed that the increased consumption of coal and water for carrying this increased weight represented only a nominal cost?

Fifth. Post-office cars cost (according to the testimony) from \$2,500 to \$6,000, or an average of probably less than \$5,000. In addition to the regular pay for the mail which they carry, the Government pays an additional annual rental of about \$5,700, or about \$700 more each year than the actual cost of the car.

The majority report opposes any reduction of this rental principally because of the ratio of "dead" to "paying load," the elaborate and convenient fittings of the cars, and their use by the Department at other times than when actually running.

Fifth query. If these so-called post-office cars were not used, would not the railroad companies be obliged to furnish regular apartment cars, such as always have been and still are used and for which no additional rental is paid?

In running "post office" cars in place of "apartment" cars, what additional cost is incurred by the company exclusive of interest on difference in cost of cars, annual depreciation of the difference in cost, the fuel and water for drawing the increased load, and a possible difference in cost of maintenance?

The testimony on page 500, part 2, calls attention to the fact that between \$6,000,000 and \$7,000,000 is annually charged for "equipment received by railway service," which equipment is described by a post-office official as representing the "post-office car dressings," and appears to include, among other items, the sacks and pouches which serve as receptacles for the mail distributed on route, and whose principal function is similar to that of the wooden cases and boxes into which the mail is likewise distributed, but which are not weighed and charged for as equipment, because, although much heavier in weight than the sacks and pouches, they are permanently attached to the car.

Does the commission recommend, in addition to the regular pay for the carrying of the mail, the continuance of the present annual charge of nearly four and a half million dollars as rental for post-office cars, and this additional annual charge of between six and seven millions for carrying the "post-office car dressings?"

Continuing, the report says:

In trying to reach a determination upon what basis railway-mail pay should be determined, the majority report tells "how not to do it," by ignoring freight, express, and passenger comparisons, and attempts to tell "how to do it," by recommending an untried method which some railroad authorities have claimed to be impracticable, and of the practical operation of which no actual instance has been cited.

The report puts another query to the commission, as follows:

Inasmuch as the suggested "method by analysis" would be dependent for its basis of calculations upon such figures and information as would be furnished by the railroad companies, would it not be reasonable to expect that in preparing such figures and information the interests of the railroads

might receive rather more consideration than the interests of the Government?

And in view of its so-called "impracticability" by railroad experts, and in the light of recent experience as to the practicable rate of progress in investigating this matter, is it not possible that a complete and satisfactory test of the "method by analysis" would postpone for an indefinite period the final consideration of the question?

The report, continuing, says:

The majority report declines "to take the passenger service of the railroads as a basis for the determination of the railway-mail pay" upon the ground that "there are too many points of difference between the passenger and mail transportation."

Here is the query that the board of trade put to the commission in answer to that contention of theirs:

Are not both mail and passenger cars drawn, in the great majority of instances, by the same locomotive and in the same train?

Are not both mail and passenger cars heated, lighted, cleaned, and supplied with water?

Are not the railroads liable in both cases for injury to individuals?

Are not the mail and about an equivalent proportion of the passenger service both "commutative" in character?

Inasmuch as infants are charged no fare, children under a certain age half fare, and adults, with the privilege of carrying 150 pounds of baggage, full fare; and inasmuch as large discounts are offered for a party or number of travelers, or for return trips, or for monthly or yearly contracts, is it not possible that "weight and space," "volume of traffic," and "frequency of service" practically constitute the same unit upon which both mail and passenger rates are actually determined at the present time?

If that is true, if weight and space, volume of traffic, and frequency of service are to be considered, they apply to both practically the same, and therefore it is very fair and equitable to compare passenger rates with mail rates. Mr. Shallenberger, in his report on postal affairs in Europe, says that everybody in Europe told him that they compared the passenger service with the mail service, and that they had one inflexible rule, and that was they would never pay more for mail than for passenger service per ton per mile. If that is true, then we are paying nearly twice too much for the mail. The railroads haul a pound of passenger for half what they do a pound of mail. In other words, considering a passenger to weigh 200 pounds, we pay more for carrying 200 pounds of mail in a baggage car or a railway post-office car on the same train than the 200-pound passenger pays sitting back in a passenger coach.

Mr. SEWELL. Will the Senator from North Carolina allow an interruption?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. SEWELL. The mail car carries about 2 tons a day at the outside, and it can not be increased. The speed is the same and the acceleration of speed is the same. It costs more than it does to transport passengers, under that idea. Passengers load the car very much more than do the mails. That is the real point. You can not give to a railroad company in the mail-car service the amount that they get from passengers on the same train. Then trains run at an increased speed. From 35 miles an hour a few years ago it has come to 60 miles an hour. I wish to say that the acceleration of speed in the mail service and the limited capacity of the postal cars with the clerks make all the difference between the transportation of mail and that of passengers.

Mr. BUTLER. You may take almost any train and weigh the mail in the train as you catch it up, and then take the weight of the passengers in the passenger car, and the weight of the mail will be found to be just about as great as the weight of passengers. In other words, here is a mail car with only 2 tons, as the Senator says, while they carry as high as 6 tons. That mail car has 3 tons of mail, but right behind it is a passenger coach with 10 passengers in it, each weighing 200 pounds, and they make 1 ton. If there are 20 passengers in it—and an average car is pretty full when you have 20 passengers in it—you would have the same weight of passengers as of mail. Therefore the comparison is nearer than any other you can make. The only difference is the passenger coach costs more money and is more luxurious. So it is more expensive to the road to haul the passengers than it is to haul the mail in an apartment car or a railway post-office car. These facts have been brought out. It requires no argument when you simply state the facts, as I have done, to show that we certainly ought not to pay more for carrying 200 pounds of mail than for carrying a 200-pound passenger; and yet we are paying twice as much, and the commission says that is right. It says we can not compare mail with passengers, and it is all right to pay twice as much for mail as for passengers because it is not fair to compare them.

This report continues:

Inasmuch as the passenger service is admitted to be more expensive than mail in the items of printing, selling and collecting tickets, auditing accounts, spacious and expensive stations, with elaborate and costly convenience, advertising, outside agencies, and train and station baggage masters—

Just listen to all those things. The railroads do not have to advertise. They do not have to spend an enormous amount of money to get the mail to carry. It comes to the railroad without a cent of expense. There is no printing to be done. There are no agents to be hired to solicit the business. The Government takes care of it. The railroads do not have to employ officials and clerks

and other persons to handle the mails and distribute them like they do to handle their freight. They do not have to have a man in a baggage room to check trunks for mail as they do for passengers. The passenger business entails considerable expense in dozens of ways that the mail does not. So the passenger service ought to be much higher than the mail service. The report continues:

And inasmuch as President Spencer has demonstrated the ratio of "dead" to "paying load" to be twice as great in the passenger service as in the mail service—

Twice as much dead load in the passenger service as in the mail service—

And inasmuch as passenger and baggage rates per ton-mile, as determined by the natural laws of competitive business, can be readily ascertained with reasonable accuracy:

And inasmuch as the principle of "reasoning by analogy" is employed to a greater or less degree in all lines of practical business, and readily enables an architect or contractor to estimate the difference in cost between two structures of equal size and having the same foundations, walls, and roof, but of which one is to be finished perfectly plain for manufacturing or warehousing purposes, and the other finished with expensive wood, marble, tiling, frescoing, electroliers, passenger elevators, modern sanitary plumbing, and such other expensive details as add to the artistic beauty and conveniences of a modern sales room:

In view of the above does it not seem reasonable to assume that the utilization of the method of "Reasoning by analogy," based upon conditions as they actually exist, is more likely to secure an accurate, equitable, and practical solution to the problem, and also secure it promptly, than would an untried method, pronounced impracticable by those who would be required to demonstrate and operate it, and in the prosecution of which figures might be inadvertently employed which would afterwards prove to be as fallacious and misleading as were the census statistics upon the express business—

Which this commission had to brand as incorrect to get around. They had had to attack the official statistics of the Government, and say they were false because there was no answer, if they were correct, but to reduce the railway mail pay 25 per cent. Continuing, the report says:

Or the former erroneous figures of a prominent post-office official regarding the average rate of railway mail pay?

Eighth. Notwithstanding the obvious fact that the actual expenses associated with the handling and transportation of mail are less than for the handling and transportation of a similar weight of passengers and baggage, does not a railway president, on page 680, part 1, testify that the gross revenue per ton hauled 1 mile, including dead load, is 28 per cent greater for mail than for passengers?

It is more than that, but here is the president of a railroad in his testimony who admits that. Now, in view of that testimony, the board of trade puts this query to the commission:

Has this statement ever been repudiated?

No. The commission could not do it. Continuing, the report says:

The railway passenger business is practically divided into two classes: (a) General passenger service, in which the passenger travels rarely or only occasionally. This branch of the service might appropriately be compared with retail operations. (b) Commutation service, in which the passenger specifically contracts to pay for daily or frequent rides within a limited period. This branch might appropriately be compared with wholesale operations.

This committee put this query to the Postal Commission:

Inasmuch as the mail business is pre-eminently "commutative," by reason of the fact that the Government contracts to pay for every day in the year, Sunday included, with which class of passenger rates should mail rates therefore be logically compared?

The answer is obvious.

Passing on to the second report, which is supplementary to the majority report, we come to the rather surprising opinion that "the railroad companies do not derive a profit from the carriage of mails."

What I have read is an analysis of the majority report of the commission. This now is an analysis of the second report found in this volume, and the committee put this inquiry to the members of the commission who sign the report:

Does the author actually mean that if the mails were withdrawn from railroads which now receive \$100,000, \$1,000,000, or \$3,000,000 per annum for that service, that the railroads could reduce their fixed charges or operating expenses to a greater degree than the above respective figures in consequence of such withdrawal?

Yes, if he is right, and we take all the mails off the trains and send them by wagons, it would reduce the economies of the railroad to such an extent that they could make more profit or pay their employees higher wages. That is the monstrously absurd proposition advanced by a distinguished member of the commission. Continuing, the report says:

If the railroads are actually carrying the mails at a loss, would it not be a paying policy for them to encourage, so far as practicable, the granting of all mail contracts to their competitors?

Does history record one such instance?

I regret very much that the member of the commission who makes this astonishing statement did not name what railroad companies within his personal knowledge have labored with their competitors and tried to get their competitors to take the mail contracts and relieve them of the burden of carrying the mail and the loss entailed. It would be an interesting part of the history of this country which has not yet got into print. It would be a pity to lose so unique and peculiar and important a piece of history.

The third report, also partly supplementary to the majority report, seems to attach a fanciful significance to the ratio of "dead" to "paying" load.

It also recommends the continuance of the investigation by a commission composed of the commission's expert, a representative of the Department, and a representative of the railroads.

The committee puts this query to the Postal Commission:

In view of the fact that personal interest would necessarily dominate one of these experts, and also the fact that the testimony of some officials of the Department warrants the inference that they believed the railroads were now underpaid, would not the verdict of a majority of such a commission be a foregone conclusion?

And I think the same might be said as to the present commission. Everybody knew when the commission was appointed what the report would be. I suppose they did. I never anticipated any different report. Therefore the important thing about it is not the recommendation, but the facts that did manage to get into the testimony. I think if the commission had been more fairly composed as to the views of the members a great many important facts would have gotten into the testimony that did not get into the testimony. Continuing, the report says:

We now come to the fourth report, which argues several of the propositions upon strict business principles and reaches very conservative conclusions, inasmuch as it simply recommends the abolition of the special mail facilities appropriation and the adoption of Professor Adams's conservative table of reduction varying from 5 to 12 per cent.

Your committee is of the opinion that the arguments in the minority report will appeal more strongly to practical business men than the majority report.

Now, here is this body of business men who take up the two reports, the majority and the minority. They have criticised the majority report and shown that it was not in accordance with the facts. Then they call attention to the strong, clear, and business-like minority report, and call the attention of the country to the fact that on the bare reading of these two reports, without investigating the testimony, the minority report will commend itself to any fair-minded business man as being fairer in statement of facts and sounder in reasoning. Continuing, this report says:

And we sincerely regret that the majority of the commission did not see their way clear to recommend this slight concession, which, in the judgment of your committee, represents but a small part of the reduction which might have been recommended and still leave a handsome profit to the railroads.

I regret that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] is now out of his seat. He asked me what these business men recommended.

Mr. SPOONER. I am listening to the Senator, if he refers to me.

Mr. BUTLER. I call his attention to this paragraph:

Your committee is of the opinion that the arguments in the minority report—

Which I have read—

will appeal more strongly to practical business men than the majority report, and we sincerely regret that the majority of the commission did not see their way clear to recommend this slight concession—

Recommended by Professor Adams—

which, in the judgment of your committee—

That is, this committee of the National Board of Trade—

represents but a small part of the reduction which might have been recommended and still leave a handsome profit to the railroads.

Here is the conclusion of a select body of business men, men who have conducted their own businesses successfully, men who have given more investigation to this question than a single Senator probably in this body; and I am satisfied they have. After studying it for years, after investigating it for three or four years and then analyzing and studying a report of the commission, they say that the minority recommends only a small part of the reduction that ought to be made. They are not hostile to railroads. They are simply practical business men who want 1-cent letter postage and a parcels post, citizens who want to see justice between the Government and the railroads—whose attention was called to these facts. I say this statement of theirs, passed unanimously by this great body of business men, ought to have great weight with any Senator, and especially those who have not had time to investigate this matter for themselves. Continuing, the report says:

One feature of the majority report is to be seriously regretted. It quotes over one hundred references to the testimony, all of which are substantially favorable to the railroads or to the points brought out in the majority report; and although the report disclaims any desire that undue prominence be given to that testimony, it is reasonable to assume that but few Congressmen or others could spare the time to carefully search the 2,000 pages of testimony for the comparatively few pages of conflicting evidence.

Now, that is a just criticism, I think, of the commission. The National Board of Trade apologizes for making it, and says they regret to do it, but they feel it is their duty in making their report to tell the truth and to state the facts. They are struck with the fact that the majority of the commission does not quote the testimony or refer to that part of it which shows rates are too high, but quotes from the testimony given by railroad presidents and makes up their report on ex parte testimony while ignoring all the testimony in rebuttal. A person reading their report would suppose that there was not any testimony taken except

that which said the railroads were not paid enough. Continuing, this report says:

Under the circumstances it would seem fitting and equitable to adopt the following resolutions and send copy of same to each member of Congress.

I suppose each member of Congress has a copy. I see they declare in favor of sending a copy of the resolutions to each member of Congress. The resolutions, which I will not take time to read, but will insert them in the RECORD, indorse the minority report and the reduction recommended by Professor Adams, and express regret that the recommendation was not for a larger amount.

The resolutions are as follows:

Whereas the report of the Joint Congressional Commission to investigate railway-mail pay contains numerous specific references to the testimony; and Whereas the National Board of Trade always favors the full and impartial investigation and consideration of both sides of every important question;

Resolved, That we respectfully recommend the reading of the testimony beginning on page 102, in part 2, and the cross-examination of the same evidence beginning on page 443, in part 2, and we also respectfully offer the suggestion that the comparisons there made may be correspondingly modified and adjusted to suit any of the shifting opinions regarding length of haul without impairing the logical principle underlying the comparison.

Resolved, That we reaffirm our former recommendation for such adjustment of railway-mail pay as will be equitable to the railroads, the Government, and the people.

Now, continuing, this report says:

So far as the present investigation of this question is concerned your committee feels that it has performed its full share of a public duty, and is now willing to rest its case and leave the matter with the present or a future Congress, or to those who may be called upon in the future to prosecute the investigation still further.

It has no cause to regret the past. It is true that the use of official statistics which, at the time, were generally recognized as reliable, led, necessarily, to some incorrect deductions, but even these very deductions, made in good faith and justified by the evidence at that time, have no doubt been the direct cause of inaugurating an investigation which has swept away many false statistics and deductions and given us a truer and more scientific basis upon which to stand; and this clearance of falsity will no doubt prove fully as beneficial to the railroads as to any other interest concerned. Whatever fallacies or errors may exist in our reports and testimony will soon sink into deserved obscurity, but that which is inherently true in fact and in principle will survive, and at the right time, and under circumstances which may be untraceable to human causes, will assume its proper place and exert its proper influence—for no power in the universe can destroy or permanently suppress that which is inherently true.

We assume that many of our delegates have received a copy of a pamphlet containing the argument of Mr. Edward D. Kenna, vice-president of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway, in opposition to the use of commutation rates as a basis for determining mail rates.

In a letter to Mr. Kenna, your chairman stated that he would present a résumé of his arguments at this meeting, but the unexpected length of this report requires it to be very brief.

Mr. Kenna does not dispute the accuracy of the commutation rates which were quoted, but explains somewhat elaborately why they were made. He, however, questions the fairness of your chairman in quoting certain rates which were afterwards discontinued. As a matter of fact, however, the cards containing these printed rates were procured, in good faith, at one of the regular ticket offices of the company in question, and nothing was known of the subsequent change until after the accidental receipt of Mr. Kenna's pamphlet.

Mr. Kenna furnishes a condensed statement of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, showing their average earnings from commutation passengers to the cent, 1.222 per mile. As this average rate is so much higher than the commutation rates with which your chairman is personally familiar, he thinks it would be necessary to analyze the report in detail before attempting to discuss it.

This report continues now to take up some of the testimony taken by the commission and to analyze it. Here is a very complete and clear analysis of the testimony of a railway president and facts presented to show wherein it is incorrect. But inasmuch as we can not take the time to take up all the testimony in that report and treat it in the same way, I will not take the time to read this part of the report, but I will put it in the RECORD so that those who are interested in the matter can get at it.

Mr. Kenna argues that commutation passenger rates can be made low for the following reasons:

First reason. Because the commutation passenger haul is short.

Reply: The paradoxical feature of this argument is that in every instance of commutation rates of which we have knowledge the short haul has been at a higher rate per mile than the longer haul.

Second reason. Because commutation passenger rates induce density of traffic and fill coaches and furnish many trains that can be operated with little if any additional requirement and at slight additional expense.

Reply: A careful analysis of the above features may disclose a striking resemblance to some of the inherent features of the commutation mail service.

Third reason. Because it adds an increased suburban population whose supplies the carrier hauls at local rates.

Reply: While in Eastern cities many of the supplies of suburban residents are delivered by local teams from the large cities and not by the railroads, the principle is nevertheless clear and logical that certain special rates may be justified because of the profitable business which it directly causes or encourages. This argument, however, applies with special force to the prompt and efficient carrying of mail, inasmuch as the marvelous increase in the quantity of freight transported is partly due to the promptness with which modern postal facilities enable business to be transacted; and if we could conceive of the possible extinction of the mail service without substituting an equally efficient agency, every railroad in the country would, sooner or later, be forced into bankruptcy by reason of depleted business.

Fourth reason. Because party rates move business that otherwise could not be induced to move.

Reply: This is exactly what 1-cent letter postage and a cheap parcels-post system would do not only for the business community but for the railroads as well, because of the increased interchange and consequent necessary

transportation of both letters and merchandise, and if railway mail pay were brought down to the basis of commutation passenger pay 1-cent letter postage and a cheap parcels-post system would be assured.

Fifth reason. Because the commuters' cars are usually filled to their full capacity.

Reply: We presume that some of our Eastern companies would gladly pay a large premium to have this ideal condition introduced on their roads, for around Philadelphia we generally find the incoming trains to be comparatively full in the morning and empty in the evening, while the outgoing trains are comparatively full in the evening but empty in the morning. In regard to mail, however, it makes no difference whether the car is full at one time or empty at another—the road receives the average pay just the same for every day in the year.

Sixth reason. Because commuters don't use the whole length of a railroad company's line, but only a very small portion, while mail does.

Reply: It would seem to us that if the passengers could be induced to occupy and pay for car space the entire length of the line that this would be more profitable than to have empty cars a great part of the distance.

It would also seem to us that if the mail is carried the full length of the line and pays for each mile it is carried that this argument is in favor of the mail.

Seventh reason. Because the commuter "delivers" himself, while mail must be delivered to the post-office if less than 80 rods distant.

Reply: How would the value of the time taken by station master in making these short deliveries several times a day compare with the time consumed by the agent in selling the commuters' tickets, the conductor's time in collecting them, and the train and station baggage masters' time in occasionally handling their baggage?

Eighth reason. Because the commuters' train is immediately emptied and used, while the mail car is held for hours at terminals.

Reply: It is difficult to reconcile this statement with testimony of other railroad officials, who contend that mail cars are more constantly in use and travel farther each day than passenger cars.

Ninth reason. Because commuters' cars are filled to their full capacity, while only 2 tons of mail are put in a car that will hold 40 tons.

Reply: How many "tons" of passengers can be put in a passenger car made to hold 40, 50, or 60 passengers, even if every seat is occupied? And what proportion of trains can claim to have cars always full?

Conditions may be more favorable in the West, but in the official report of the Lehigh Valley Railroad for 1898 the average number of passengers per car is given as 12; and the average number per entire train of 4 cars is only 30.

Tenth reason. Because the party and commutation rate business furnishes but a small percentage of the entire passenger business.

Reply: The author probably was not aware that this argument directed special attention to the singular coincidence that the receipts of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company for commutation passenger service were almost identical with their receipts from their mail service.

Eleventh reason. Because "the longer the haul of the passenger train the greater the expense per mile."

Reply: Does Mr. Kenna mean that a long haul is more expensive per mile than a short haul, other conditions being equal? If so, the business principles in railroading are in direct conflict with business principles in the commercial world; and it is also somewhat singular that some of the most prosperous railroads of the country are those who furnish the "longest haul," although restricted from charging more than the legal rate per mile.

I will ask the attention of the Senate to this paragraph in the report. It is in response to a question asked about what Mr. Acker means:

Twelfth reason. Attention is called to small routes which do not carry more than 200 pounds a day. The question is asked whether Mr. Acker means that a railroad can afford to apply reduced rates where there is a single passenger daily.

Reply: The question of whether a reduction can be made depends upon how the rate which the railroad is now getting for carrying 200 pounds of mail compares with their rate for carrying an equal weight of passengers. Inasmuch as the rate for mail in 200-pound lots daily is \$1.17 per ton mile, while a single passenger and baggage at the full rate of 3 cents per mile would yield approximately only 30 cents per ton mile, and a low commutation passenger rate would be only 3 cents per ton mile, it seems to us there is sufficient margin for some reduction. It should, however, be borne in mind that no railroad company is required to put on any additional trains for carrying a small quantity of mail. It is simply required to carry the mail on trains which have already been scheduled and which are for the benefit of the passenger service. What it gets for carrying the mail is, in many instances, merely so much additional revenue with but little extra expense.

Thirteenth reason. The final argument is that commutation rates are made to increase the revenue of the railroads—

This is the contention of the roads themselves—

and if the Government will show the railroads how they can, by decreasing the mail pay, increase their revenue, the latter will quickly make the reductions, and unless this is done it is idle to apply a principle of transportation intended to increase revenue as a reason for reducing it.

In reply to that contention this report says:

Reply: The chairman of your committee pleads guilty to the charge of having once, about two years ago, assumed the character of the so-called "universal suggester" who was so graphically and eloquently pictured to you a year ago, but that was when he cherished certain theoretical and sentimental ideas that the great railroad interests of this country, who have it in their power to give such vital impetus to manufacturing and commercial activity and to the culture and happiness of our people, might be made to see that an equitable reduction in railway-mail pay would quickly introduce 1-cent letter postage and a cheap parcels-post system, and thereby stimulate still further the interchange of ideas through correspondence, and the opening up of new channels of trade, and thereby also increase the traffic of the railroads in the same manner that lower freight rates have directly developed new business, and special excursion rates have drawn the citizens of one section of our country to visit and fraternize with the people in other sections, thereby helping to break down the narrow prejudices of sectionalism and cementing the bonds which united the four quarters of our great country into one harmonious brotherhood of Americans.

It was hoped at that time that the demonstration of these features to the railroads might possibly induce them to voluntarily offer a 25 per cent reduction, but the demonstrator of that proposition is obliged to confess that after two years' experience he has not discovered the slightest evidence to sustain this pleasing fancy, and the last remark of Mr. Kenna is somewhat ominous. Theoretically the Government determines the rate of railway mail pay (upon the assumption, however, that the rate be equitable), but

Mr. Kenna's closing remark suggests that the power of reducing it rests primarily with the railroads.
We wish it were otherwise.
Respectfully submitted.

FINLEY ACKER, *Chairman*.
BLANCHARD RANDALL,
A. T. ANDERSON,
JNO. FIELD, *Committee*.

The report says:
We wish it were otherwise.

So should we all.

Mr. President, I have not read all of this report, but it will all appear in my remarks. It is a very valuable document, and I shall print all of it in the RECORD, because it is a very intelligent report and throws much light on this question. Representing as it does a large body of prominent and important business men, it should have great weight and it deserves a place in the permanent records of the Government.

Mr. President, I do not know that I care to continue this discussion. I have condensed what I have said as much as possible, considering the magnitude of the question. I have covered as much ground as I can cover, unless I should take the time to take up the testimony and read from conflicting testimony, and put before the Senate what one witness would say was a fact and what another witness would say was not a fact, and take the deductions of one witness and compare them with another who contradicted him. Of course that would take a very long time. I have neither the desire to go through that laborious effort nor has the Senate the time. But if I had the time to do it, and if the Senate had time to listen to it, I do believe that the majority of this body would do just what the National Board of Trade has done. After a careful investigation of every particle of the testimony, they came to the conclusion that the majority of the commission are wrong; and they came to the further conclusion that the slight reduction recommended by Professor Adams of 5 per cent, and which is also recommended by the minority of the commission, is too small, and is only, to use their own words, a small part of the reduction that ought to be made and can be made, and still leave a handsome profit to the railroads for carrying the mails.

If such a reduction were made, it would wipe out the deficit and leave a surplus at the present time of \$6,000,000 to the credit of the Post-Office Department and put us where we could afford to give the business men of the country, who are asking for it, 1-cent letter postage, and where we would be in a position to start a parcels-post system without a prospect of further bankrupting the Treasury.

Now, the question is, Shall we vote this \$10,000,000 to the railroads above a fair profit and tax the people to pay that enormous bonus, or shall we vote a reasonable rate of pay on business principles, as shown by this evidence?

The Reapportionment Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. JONES,

OF VIRGINIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, January 8, 1901.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 12740) making an apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Twelfth Census—

Mr. JONES of Virginia said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The report which accompanies the Hopkins bill, presented on behalf of a majority of the Committee on the Twelfth Census, assigns but two reasons for fixing the number of the House of Representatives at 357 members. These two reasons are very briefly set forth in these words:

A majority of your committee are of the opinion that economy and dispatch of business require that the number of Representatives in the House shall not be increased over its present membership.

But it is not proposed that all of the several States shall retain their present representation. Eight of them, including the State of Virginia, with an aggregate population of one-fifth of the whole population of the United States, are to lose 1 Representative each, whilst six are to gain each a Representative and one is to gain 2. It is, therefore, by decreasing the representation of eight and increasing that of seven of the forty-five States that the present number of Representatives is to be preserved. The method pursued is to

divide the total constitutional population of 74,565,906 by 357, the proposed number of Representatives, which will give a quotient of 208,868 as the ratio of Representatives to population.

Applying this ratio successively to the population of each State will yield in the aggregate a somewhat smaller number than the 357 fixed upon as the House membership, as the report points out; but the deficiency is supplied by assigning additional Representatives to the States having the largest majority fractions. For instance, New York, Texas, and West Virginia are each to receive an additional Representative on a majority fraction, whilst Colorado, Florida, and North Dakota, although each has a majority fraction, are to be given none. Thus, although the majority of the committee base their apportionment to a certain extent upon major fractions, they refuse to recognize and apply that principle as to three States. This, being a discrimination against these States, is a palpable injustice to them, and in itself constitutes an insuperable objection to the plan upon which the Hopkins bill is framed.

Mr. Speaker, in fixing the basis of representation for this House I am well aware that many of us may be unconsciously influenced by the effect the result will have upon the States we represent, and it may be, too, that the bearing which that basis will have upon our individual political fortunes may warp our judgments, but I can not believe that a plan which discriminates against any States can command a majority of the votes of this body.

The Burleigh bill, which has the indorsement of six members of the Census Committee, it must be admitted, I think, is the more just and equitable measure. It fixes the membership of the House at 383 Representatives and apportions them among the several States according to a method which is set forth in the printed views of the minority of the committee in these words:

In reaching this number we have adopted the method used by the committee and referred to by the Director of the Census in his letter to the chairman of the committee as "the first method," "which has been followed from 1820 to 1890," "with variations of detail," and in making the "variations of detail" we have followed the precedent established by the House in 1872, when the House added to the whole number of Representatives a Representative each for the States of New Hampshire and Florida by reason of the fact that they each had almost a majority fraction after the whole number of Representatives had been apportioned.

We take the computation based upon 334 Representatives, upon a ratio of one Representative for every 194,182 of population. As shown in Table 2 of the letter of the Director of the Census above referred to, Nebraska, with a majority fraction of 97,629, and Virginia, with a majority fraction of 108,546, each lose a Representative and get no Representative for the majority fraction in either case.

These are the only States having majority fractions that fail to get a Representative therefor. This seems to us an injustice. Therefore, following the precedent above referred to in the case of New Hampshire and Florida in 1872, we assign to each of these States one Representative for each majority fraction, thus adding two to the whole number, making in all under our proposed bill 336 Representatives.

By this method the present membership of the House is increased just 29, but no State loses a Representative, and no State should lose one, for no one of the eight which lose under the Hopkins bill has suffered any loss in population. On the contrary, each one of them has made a substantial gain in population during the last decade. In the aggregate the population of these eight States has increased more than a million and a half, and that of Virginia has increased 198,204.

I shall not discuss the "economy" argument so gravely put forward by the majority of the committee. It is not, in my opinion, worthy a moment's serious consideration. Indeed, so far as I can recall, no advocate of the Hopkins bill has alluded to it during this debate. No one has or will attach the slightest importance to an argument so obviously without weight. It but serves to show to what lengths the committee has been driven in their search for reasons to support their arbitrary proposition.

The contention that public business can be more expeditiously and better dispatched in a body the size of the present House than in one with a slightly increased membership is scarcely less well founded. If ever thought to be entitled to any consideration, I think I may fairly assume that it has been most effectually disposed of during the progress of this debate. I need not, therefore, waste words upon such a threadbare argument as this.

The American House of Representatives has already well-nigh lost its character as a deliberative body. It is governed by a set of rules so despotic that under their operation three men, a majority of the Rules Committee, are clothed with the autocratic power of determining what measures shall be considered by the House, and, when considered, just how many brief minutes and seconds shall be consumed in their consideration. The least experienced member of this body has time and again witnessed the passage of measures carrying appropriations of tens, sometimes of hundreds of millions of dollars, and of others involving the very life and well-being of our free institutions, to the consideration of which only a beggarly few minutes were given.

The individuality of the members of this House has long ago been lost, so that under rules which are intended to suppress, and which do suppress, all free speech, cut off debate and prevent any real consideration of public questions of the greatest magnitude,

a House composed of 386 members can not possibly be more unwieldy or more unmanageable than one composed of only a few less members. As everybody knows no such thing as freedom of debate is permitted in this House, and the rule of gag law can be invoked with as much ease and dispatch in a House composed of 300 as in one composed of 400 members.

But aside from all this, an increase of only 29 members is not sufficiently large to materially affect the question, and even if any inconvenience were entailed we can afford to submit to some in order to obtain a fuller, freer, and, so to speak, closer representation of the people, one in which the Representative will be more closely identified with his constituents.

The history of all legislative assemblies attests that the larger the popular branch the more responsive are they to popular sentiment and feelings. The British House of Commons is composed of 670 members, nearly double our present House; the French Chamber of Deputies has 584; the Italian, 508; the Spanish Cortes, 431, and the German Reichstag, 397; and, so far as I am aware, no attempt has been made to reduce any such representation either on the score of economy or in order to promote and expedite legislation.

The House of Representatives is now, and will still be should its membership be increased to 386, the smallest popular representative chamber belonging to any great nation, with the single exception of Austria-Hungary, the lower house of whose Reichsrath is almost exactly the present size of this House, being just four less.

The basis of representation in the United States is already much larger than in any one of the countries I have mentioned, or, for that matter, in any known to me. It is two and a half times as large as that of France, three times what it is in England, more than 50 per cent greater than it is in Austria-Hungary, and over 20 per cent more than in Germany, which has the next largest basis of any of the great powers.

It is nearly six times the number fixed in the Constitution as the downward limit. It is not to be denied that as the population increases it is inevitable that the basis of representation should also be increased. This principle is clearly recognized in the Burleigh bill, under which the basis will be increased over 20,000, the largest increase ever before made save only under the Eleventh Census, when the increase was less than 22,000.

Mr. Speaker, when an increase in the basis of representation becomes necessary it should be made, but it should never be made any larger than the growth of population renders imperative. It should be made slowly and cautiously, and never without necessity. The evils arising from a rapid and enormous increase of the basis of representation are too obvious to be overlooked. In the first place, in proportion to the enlargement of the constituency beyond a certain moderate limit the tie uniting the representative and the represented grows feeble and less intimate. It is practically impossible that there can be the same close connection, the same identity of interest and sentiment between them.

The larger the constituency the more marked the diversities of locality, of occupation, and of circumstances which must inevitably result in a wide divergence of interests and feelings. A large constituency can not be as homogeneous as a small one, and therefore it will be more difficult for any one man faithfully to represent the whole and easier for the stronger interest or combination of interests to choose a representative who shall view all questions from their standpoint and act too exclusively as their agent.

The House of Representatives should be a faithful reflection of the people of the several States, while it should be the function of the Senate to represent the States as organized, autonomous communities, in their capacity as sovereign States. To put it in other words, the Representatives should be kept as close to the people in interests, sympathies, affections, and circumstances as possible.

Washington held this to be true, and it was due to his powerful influence over the convention of 1787 that the limit was changed from 40,000, as it originally stood, to 30,000.

The basis of representation was the subject of much discussion in the Philadelphia convention. It was fixed at 40,000, and in the last draft of that great instrument, made by the committee on style and arrangement, it was left at that number. But on the very last day of the convention, the 17th day of September, a motion was made by Mr. Nathaniel Gorham of Massachusetts to strike out 40,000 and insert 30,000, and when General Washington rose for the purpose of putting the motion he said:

His situation had hitherto restrained him from offering his sentiments on questions depending in the house, and, it might be thought, ought now to impose silence on him, yet he could not forbear expressing his wish that the alteration proposed might take place.

We are further told by Mr. Madison that this was the only occasion when the president of the convention entered into the discussions of that great body and that the change was made by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Speaker, the State which I have the honor in part to represent on this floor was assigned 10 Representatives in the First Congress, out of a total membership of 65, and only once in all the history of our country has her representation been reduced below that number.

As a result of the apportionment under the census of 1870, the first to follow the dismemberment of the Old Dominion and the erection of another State out of a part of her territory, her representation was reduced to 9, but at the next following decennial apportionment the original number was restored. Now, it is seriously proposed to again reduce the number, notwithstanding the population of the State has increased nearly 200,000 within the last decade.

To do this would be to commit an act of the grossest injustice to a State which above all others is entitled to the everlasting gratitude of the American people—the State whose noble generosity and splendid self-sacrifices made possible the adoption of our Federal Constitution and the formation of our Union of States.

Mr. Speaker, it is the bitter irony of fate that this cruel blow, if it must come, is to be dealt by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS], a Representative of one of the five great Commonwealths erected out of the imperial domain which Virginia, with unsurpassed generosity and patriotism, bestowed as a free gift upon the then infant Republic. [Applause.]

River and Harbor Bill—Port Jefferson Harbor Inlet.

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 16, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I send to the Clerk's desk to be read within my time an amendment which I desire to offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of line 2, page 33, the following:

"Port Jefferson Harbor, Suffolk County, N. Y., with a view to constructing a channel through the inlet thereto 15 feet in depth at mean low water and 200 feet in width."

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, Port Jefferson Harbor is situated on the north shore of Long Island, about 50 miles east of the city of New York. It is some 2 miles long and averages in width three-quarters of a mile. From the governmental charts it will be observed that its area has a depth approximating 18 feet at low tide. Tributary to this harbor on its west are Setauket Harbor and Conscience Bay, two shallow tidal basins.

Port Jefferson Harbor is surrounded on three sides by bold hills, and is separated from Long Island Sound on the north by a beach of sand and gravel, through which and nearly in the axis of the harbor is a single entrance approximating 400 feet in width. This entrance is known as Port Jefferson Inlet, and through it, I learn from the report of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, is discharged some 300,000,000 cubic feet of water at every tide, producing a current the maximum velocity of which exceeds 4 miles an hour. In the narrow part of this inlet the depth of water has always been considerable, but a short distance out in the Sound was located a broad, flat bar which originally had a depth of 4 feet at low tide. Before the Government began its improvement of this inlet its location shifted from time to time. It is stated that it has moved westward nearly 800 feet since 1838, or upon an average annually of 24 feet.

The shipping interests of Port Jefferson are increasing rapidly, and by reason of its location it is the most available harbor for refuge in the event of storm on the north shore of Long Island east of Eatons Neck. The great commerce and the safety of shipping interests in the Sound demand that this harbor and its inlet be so improved as to make it a harbor of refuge for the protection and promotion of commerce. The commerce of Port Jefferson Harbor consists mainly of coal, building materials, farming products, shellfish, and general merchandise. In 1899 it amounted to 42,130 tons, and was valued at \$2,145,940. In addition, the harbor is used extensively as a winter anchorage for yachts. There are upon its shores several large shipyards, where are constructed

many vessels designed for commercial and pleasure purposes and also where are repaired and refitted a great many boats of the same kind.

Mr. Chairman, that the necessity for the improvement of this harbor may be appreciated, I will state that during the year 1899 the number of vessels passing in and out of Port Jefferson Harbor, by actual count, was about 3,000, and had the inlet to the harbor been deeper this number would have been greatly increased by vessels seeking shelter in stress of weather.

The purpose of my amendment is to set in motion the machinery of the Government that will effect the deepening of the present channel to 15 feet and its widening to 200 feet the entire distance through the inlet. The channel heretofore dredged by the Government has shoaled to the eastward at the inner end, and is now less than 200 feet wide and perhaps not over 9 feet deep. The channel dredged 12 feet deep is now less than 160 feet wide and is shoaled in places to less than 10 feet.

This amendment authorizing the Secretary of War to cause to be made the proper survey to make this channel of a uniform width of 200 feet and of a uniform depth of 15 feet its entire extent should commend itself to the committee. The project will stand the closest scrutiny.

Mr. Chairman, Port Jefferson is a locality where commerce is established and growing; a locality capable of great development; into its harbor in a single year 3,000 vessels have sailed; by reason of its land-locked situation it affords protection to shipping in the severest weather. Its isolated situation must commend it to the House as worthy of the development which I urge for it. I trust its necessities will be recognized and its claims to national consideration appreciated. Mr. Chairman, my amendment should prevail; I submit it to the House in full confidence of its merits.

River and Harbor Bill—Lucas Landing.

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 16, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I offer the following amendment which the Clerk will please read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 11, page 93, after the words "deep-draft vessels," the words "Northville, Lucas Landing, Suffolk County, in Long Island Sound, with a view to constructing a breakwater."

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, along the north shore of Long Island Sound, between Port Jefferson and Mattituck, there stretches a vast area of country which has failed to receive the attention and consideration to which it would seem to be entitled. Intercourse between it and the markets of the metropolis, as well as of the cities on the Sound in the State of Connecticut, are denied to it through lack of available means being afforded its people to transport their goods and products to places of sale.

For many years the farmers of this neglected locality have felt the necessity of having their produce carried to city markets at a rate that would return them something for their labor. The railroad to New York was too remote to permit profitable carting, even if the freight rates by rail had permitted shipments to market by that carrier. To overcome these difficulties the people of this community have constructed out into the open waters of Long Island Sound a pier. This work was accomplished by these people with the laudable desire to improve their condition at the cost of a self-denial almost beyond description. The pier now affords a means of shipment to the city markets, weather permitting, but being unprotected from wind and wave, and projecting out from an open coast, it is not always available, and is often in danger of being washed away.

Mr. Chairman, it is the pride of many of the great governments of Europe that where harbors did not exist in times past through the foresight of those having in control the reins of government now are to be found ports of great commercial importance, harbors of refuge, commercial activity, and prosperity.

It seems to me that the case of these Long Island farmers which I now plead demands for them some consideration. Appropriations for harbor improvements are justified by the promotion of commerce which it is assumed will result. This dock is the only place of debarkation on Long Island Sound between Port Jefferson

and Greenport, a stretch of over 40 miles, excepting Mattituck Harbor, which, through failure of the National Government to complete the improvements there projected, is not available for the purposes for which the dock under consideration is used, even if it were within profitable carting distance, which it is not. This dock is open to all shippers, to all who desire to take passage from it on the vessels touching at it. Its use is unrestricted, I am told, for the greatest good to the greatest number. It will do much toward the development of a section of Long Island that has been sadly neglected, and which only requires proper transportation facilities to come to the front. This section of country, while one of the most productive on Long Island, is isolated and cut off from the great centers of business.

The chairman of the committee seems to have been touched by my appeal in behalf of these people, for he tells me he will not oppose the adoption of my amendment by the House. I submit the same in full confidence that it is a worthy object.

I trust the survey may be made at an early date, that a favorable report will be received from the engineers, and that the next Congress will make a proper appropriation to construct the desired breakwater and thereby protect the shipping which will flow from this point and bring to these hard-working people the benefits of safe transportation facilities to which they are entitled by their enterprise and sacrifices. [Applause.]

River and Harbor Bill—Greenport Harbor.

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 16, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I offer the following amendment, which I request the Clerk to read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of line 9, page 93, the following:

"Greenport Harbor, Suffolk County, with a view to determine and to submit an estimate of the cost of deepening the anchorage ground in Sterling Basin, in said harbor, and widening and deepening the approaches to said basin."

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, Greenport Harbor is a small anchorage ground on the southeast side of the north fork of Long Island near its eastern end. It is a part of Shelter Island Sound, a crooked and rather deep channel, which, with Shelter Island, separates the two forks of Long Island.

Greenport Harbor consists of a small bay originally exposed to northeast storms, now sheltered by a breakwater, and of a land-locked shallow anchorage with narrow entrance, known as Sterling Basin. In 1881 a project was submitted to the Congress for a breakwater to shelter the anchorage ground of Greenport to check further erosion of Joshua Point. This project was adopted in 1882. It contemplated the construction of a breakwater about 1,700 feet long, at an estimated cost of \$46,000. In 1890 the breakwater had reached a length of 1,570 feet. Then the project was modified by increasing its height and omitting its further extension. The balance of the estimate was applied to dredging in order to increase the area for sheltered anchorage.

In 1893 the project was completed, increasing the available sheltered anchorage by about 2 acres and deepening the entrance to Sterling Basin, all of which appears in Executive Document No. 44 of the Fifty-third Congress, third session, which I hold in my hand and from which I am taking my data. After this work was completed the Secretary of War was of the opinion that Greenport was worthy of further improvement by the United States; that the anchorage ground in Sterling Basin should be deepened and widened, as well as its approaches. For some reason this work was never pushed, and nothing further since has been done for Greenport, excepting the establishment of harbor lines.

Greenport is steadily increasing in importance. The freight annually received by water is estimated at not less than 200,000 tons. The improvement which is contemplated by my amendment would promote commerce in this section and add to its industrial development and profit. It is also desirable to provide safe anchorage for vessels during the winter where they can be overhauled conveniently, repaired, and fitted out—an industry extensively carried on in Greenport. Hundreds of vessels are repaired

there annually, notwithstanding the present inadequacy of this basin.

The fact that successive Congresses have made appropriation for the improvement of Greenport harbor must go a long way toward showing that it has been regarded as worthy of Federal consideration.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment contemplates the ultimate deepening of the anchorage ground in Sterling Basin and the widening and deepening of the approaches thereto. It entails no appropriation; merely calls for an estimate, which can be accompanied by a recommendation of the Secretary of War, who will make a report to the Congress setting forth the desirability of undertaking the work I urge. I bring this matter to the attention of the committee, confident that it is a worthy object; that it falls within the rule which guides the House in making appropriations for river and harbor improvements, that it will add to the commercial wealth of the village of Greenport and surrounding country, and will promote the commerce of the United States. The enterprise is favored by the Greenport Board of Trade, as well as by the people of the entire community. The amendment should receive favorable consideration at the hands of Congress. I hope the House will accept it.

River and Harbor Bill—Three-Mile Harbor.

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 16, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk and request to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at end of line 3, page 93, the following:

"Threemile Harbor, East Hampton, N. Y., with a view to constructing a channel through the inlet thereto not less than 10 feet in depth at mean low water and 200 feet in width."

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, Threemile Harbor is a landlocked bay on the north shore of the south fork of Long Island, situated some 18 miles west of Montauk Point light-house and 5 miles east of Sag Harbor. East Hampton is the nearest village to the harbor, and is distant about 2 miles from its head. There is situated the nearest railroad station.

The harbor proper is about 2 miles long and 1 mile wide; of a general triangular shape, with the base toward Gardners Bay, from which the harbor is separated by a sand beach, with an entrance channel at the east of the same. According to chart, the harbor has a maximum depth of 13 feet, with a depth of 6 feet or more over an area of three-quarters of a square mile. At the present time the entrance channel is narrow and quite crooked. The depth of the channel inside the beach is about 6 feet, except where reduced by a couple of sand spits.

This harbor once accommodated quite a coasting trade, but for many years its entrance has been gradually filling with sand. The washing away in recent years of the north point of Gardners Island has allowed the ocean swell, as well as that from the east entrance of Long Island Sound across Gardners Bay, to wash up sand and choke up the mouth of the harbor, diminishing its usefulness.

The purpose of my amendment is to authorize a survey with a view to constructing a channel through the inlet from Gardners Bay into the harbor, not less than 10 feet in depth at mean low water and 200 feet in width.

It is estimated that the present freightage interests of the locality immediately surrounding this harbor aggregate 10,000 tons a year. There are large tracts of hard-wood lands and considerable timber which would be convenient for shipping from this harbor if the same were accessible. Its shores are capable of development.

By the improvements suggested by this amendment a large area of country now of comparatively little value would be opened up. The population which would derive benefits from the improvements is not less than 2,000 souls. The residents of the town of East Hampton and Amagansett are unanimous, so far as I have been able to learn, in favor of this improvement. The shores

of this harbor are generally highlands, bespeaking a healthful locality.

I have no desire to conceal any facts in connection with this proposed project. Were I so inclined, which I am not, the chairman of the River and Harbor Committee would supply them. I frankly state them. A survey of this harbor was made in 1899. The local engineers reported at that time adversely to the improvement of the harbor. The project, however, which I have in view differs from the project which was then turned down. Moreover, a careful reading of the engineer's report will satisfy any person familiar with the conditions existing in this section of the country that the work of the local engineers was hardly as thorough as we believe the importance of the question should have warranted; therefore do I renew the request that a survey again be made to the end that if error was committed the first time justice to the people of this section of my constituency may be done, and the first error righted.

Mr. Chairman, this work will not be expensive. The local engineers are employed continuously. They have to inspect all improvements now in course of construction or maintenance on Long Island. A day or two of careful work and investigation of Threemile Harbor, when they are engaged near there, will entail little cost and will convince them, I feel confident, that a mistake was made by the engineers who first looked the ground over. Of course, under our rules and the law, an appropriation can not be secured from Congress for such an improvement as I desire to have made here excepting the report of the local engineers be indorsed favorably by the Chief of Engineers and approved by the Secretary of War. Therefore it becomes necessary for me to try this case de novo and to endeavor to secure a favorable report at the bottom of the scale, namely, from the local board of engineers.

In closing my remarks I will make mention of certain advantages which will follow the improvement of this harbor.

First. The United States Government has constructed fortifications on Gull Island and on Plum Island in Long Island Sound. Threemile Harbor would be a safe and convenient harbor for torpedo boats operating with these fortifications in the event of war.

Second. It would be a safe harbor of refuge to vessels engaged in the coasting trade, and in fishing, which pass through Long Island Sound and Gardners Bay.

Third. It would enable vessels to enter the bay for the purpose of taking aboard their cargoes of wood and merchandise which, at the present time, are obliged to load by means of scows, lighters, and small boats while lying off at some distance from the mainland.

Fourth. It would open up for development a large section of country, would foster commerce, and consequently give needed employment to a large population, besides affording an excellent harbor for steamboats and other vessels.

I hope the committee will recognize the justice of this case and will act favorably upon the amendment I have the honor to offer.

River and Harbor Bill—Hempstead Harbor.

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 16, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have an amendment which I desire to have read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at end of line 6, page 93, the following:

"Hempstead Harbor from the inlet at Barrow Beach to Roslyn, with a view of constructing a channel 12 feet in depth at mean low water and 200 feet in width."

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, Hempstead Harbor is situated on the north shore of Long Island and opens into Long Island Sound. It is a waterway of recognized importance. On its shore are located the villages of Glencove, Seacliff, Glenwood, and Roslyn.

The main factory of the National Starch Company is located upon its east shore. It has vast manufacturing interests. Its waters are constantly plowed by vessels engaged in transportation. A sand bar projecting from the west side of the harbor opposite the village of Glenwood crosses the harbor diagonally,

dividing it into two basins, connected by a narrow inlet, through which the tide flows in a swift current at each rise and fall. The village of Roslyn lies at the head of the harbor, and boasts of several manufacturing interests, lumber yards, and other industries. The channel from the gut formed by the bar I have mentioned to the head of the harbor is circuitous and uncertain.

The purpose of my amendment is to cause a survey to be made from this inlet at Barrow Beach to Roslyn, with the view of constructing a channel about 12 feet in depth at mean low water and 200 feet in width, to accommodate the growing needs of this community for better water communication with the metropolis and to afford the benefits which inevitably flow from proper water transportation facilities.

I feel a degree of hesitancy in the advocacy of this project because I am a resident of Oyster Bay Township, with a home on the shores of Hempstead Harbor. Yet if there be virtue in the saying that charity begins at home, I can find in the justice and reasonableness of the demands of my constituents in this section a complete exoneration of myself from the charge of undue favoritism to my own home in urging upon the Congress a favorable consideration of my amendment.

The chairman of the committee has been most kind to me, and I know that what he has said he thoroughly means. I believe he recognizes the merits of this project, and would be pleased to gratify me by allowing my amendment to pass were it not for the fact that this concession to me would have to be followed by concessions to a great number of Representatives, if not to nearly all of my colleagues on the floor, by the Rivers and Harbors Committee, which has already been severely criticised, in my opinion often unjustly. These concessions would be beyond the present resources of the National Treasury, and this bill would fail, if that be not the fate already in store for it.

Mr. Chairman, I know this project would receive favorable consideration if the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee had the time to personally investigate it. I have reason to believe, from the arguments which I have heard on the floor, that scores of items have been included in the bill far less worthy than this, and in favor of which little argument can be made. Time, however, does not permit the investigation which I court; and therefore I must bow to the will of the committee, feeling satisfied that I have discharged my duty in presenting the matter, and that the chairman of the committee has discharged his, in denying me the recognition I desire, but which I hope conditions will permit him to grant to my successor.

River and Harbor Bill—Jones Inlet.

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 16, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of line 7, page 93, the following:

"Jones Inlet, from the head of the lead to deep water west of Babylon, in the Great South Bay, Suffolk County."

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, it is a well-known fact that the channel through Fire Island Inlet into the Great South Bay can not be relied upon in its present state to meet the fast growing demands of the commerce of the villages on that bay, which now finds its only water outlet through the narrow confines of the inlet in order to reach the ocean and thence the markets of the country. This fact is due very largely to the ever-constant shifting of the sands of Fire Island, and the consequent change in the width, depth, and even the location of the inlet.

To substantiate this statement I will call the attention of the House to the fact that the Light-House Board refused to place gas buoys at Fire Island Inlet, or to mark the channel in any way, on account of its being unreliable through the shifting of the sand bars at its mouth.

Great South Bay, even now, is of commanding commercial importance, although Fire Island Inlet affords the only means of access to it of the great commercial interests to be found on its

shores. In addition, the advantages which it affords for sport are not to be underestimated or lost to sight, notwithstanding the fact that commercial and agricultural needs are the main factors which warrant a governmental expenditure of national funds for improvements of the character I advocate for this section.

It is proposed, by the amendment which I have just had read, to make a survey of Jones Inlet from the head of the lead to deep water west of Babylon in Great South Bay, Suffolk County, the purpose being to open up a channel through this inlet which will bring the greater part of the bay from 12 to 15 miles nearer the city of New York, and enable shippers of goods, as well as of oysters, clams, fish, vegetables, and other products, to send the same direct to the markets of the metropolis without cartages and reshippings, as are now necessary. The benefits which will flow from such an improvement will fully justify and compensate the Government for its undertaking.

The main purpose of governmental expenditure for the improvement of rivers and harbors is to make their waters navigable, to the end that commerce may be promoted. That wise purpose could not be put to a better test than in the case I now present to the consideration of the House.

As already stated, a channel through Jones Inlet would bring the villages on the Great South Bay from 15 to 20 miles less distant from New York. For an illustration: To reach Babylon from Jones Inlet at the present time it is necessary to sail about 12 miles outside in a southwesterly direction, then through the inlet northeast about 3 miles, then almost directly north across the bay again 5 miles, through a narrow channel, to Babylon village. Jones Inlet is almost a direct line from the ocean through Great South Bay to all the towns on its borders. Among the communities that will profit by this improvement are the villages of Bellport, Patchogue, Bluepoint, Sayville, Islip, Bayshore, and Babylon. They represent a great wealth in commerce, and all of them would naturally develop as a result of the benefits derived from this improvement. The opening of this inlet would afford to the people of these villages an opportunity to obtain direct communication by water with Elizabethport, N. J., whereby they would reach the coal markets of the country and secure their coal free from the expense now entailed by two reshippings.

It must be borne in mind that this amendment will entail little expense upon the Government. As is well known to the House, before an appropriation can be secured Congress must provide for a preliminary survey to be made by the Bureau of Engineers of the United States Army. This work is done through the local board of engineers, who survey the field and make their recommendations to the Chief of Engineers. He, in turn, makes his report to the Secretary of War, who reports and recommends or disapproves to the Congress, as circumstances may warrant. All of these reports must be favorable, under the rules of the House and the law as it now stands, before moneys can be appropriated for the improvement.

Mr. Chairman, by requesting this survey I court the closest scrutiny. If the Government's experts do not find the field ripe for the undertaking, they will not recommend it. If, on the other hand, commerce will be promoted by the improvement, and the benefits which will flow to my constituency and to the country will warrant the expense involved, it is but right that the fact should be known, that justice may be done to these important interests which I have the honor of representing.

The chairman of the committee tells me that while he has no doubt that this case is meritorious, at the same time there must be a limit, and therefore he feels constrained to stand by the bill as reported by the committee and withhold his consent to this amendment. I appreciate well that without his consent the amendment must share the fate of all other amendments which have been attempted, and will be voted down. And yet I can not refrain from filing my protest against this action, which seems to me arbitrary. I well appreciate the difficulties that have had to be met and overcome by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. They had presented to them projects involving an outlay of over \$300,000,000 from which to select those which they considered truly meritorious, and which fell within the general rule justifying the expenditure of Federal funds for such works only when the interest of commerce will be promoted.

Mr. Chairman, the claims I urge fall within that rule. Perhaps nowhere in the world is to be found a bay situated as is the Great South Bay, on Long Island—miles of inland water, accessible only through one little inlet, constantly shifting and changing in character. In olden times the waters of this bay were most productive. They seem now to have lost many of their vital life-giving properties, due to the inability of the waters of the sea to flow into and out of the bay, cleansing it of its impurities as of old. In former times Great South Bay boasted of the finest oysters, clams, and all varieties of fish. Then Fire Island Inlet was deeper and broader, admitting immense volumes of fresh sea water to flow into the bay with each tide. At that time, also, Flat Beach was not as low as it now is, and the tides and waves frequently

swept across it into the bay. Now, however, Flat Beach has builded up almost to the height of the rest of Fire Island, and for years the waters of the sea have failed to break across it.

Everyone is familiar with the famous Blue Point oyster. It is here in this bay that it has its habitat, but it is losing its superiority because deprived of the purifying properties of the strong, fresh sea water which can no longer reach it. Quantities of oyster as well as of clam spawn, which grow over all sections of the bottom of Great South Bay, die before attaining their proper size for lack of the life-giving salt-water current. The opening of this inlet and the admission to Great South Bay of greater volumes of salt water will develop the oyster and clam interests of that section, which will take a new start and afford remunerative employment to a large class of people, bringing material wealth to the surrounding country.

I urge the advantages which result to every community where competition in transportation rates is found. At the present time goods and merchandise from all the villages which I have named reach the metropolis by railroad. There is but the one connecting them with the city of New York. The improvement of the Great South Bay by the construction of proper channels and inlets would be quickly followed by the establishment of water transportation lines, which would compete with the railroad, force freight rates down, and benefit the people, and this without injuring the road, because the development of business as a result of the improvement would increase the volume of goods that would have to be transported.

Mr. Chairman, I have argued this case at some length because I appreciate its importance, and because I desire to place on the record evidence of my efforts in behalf of my constituents. While I can not succeed now because the chairman of the committee feels constrained to oppose me, I believe I accomplish some good in presenting this matter to the House, as it will enable my successor to take the work up unhampered as I am by reason of the fact that the enterprise I suggest is deemed a new one and therefore not to be accepted in the first instance.

River and Harbor Bill—Parsonage Cove.

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 16, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have another amendment to offer, which I send to the Clerk's desk and request to have read within my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at end of line 3, page 93, the following:

"Parsonage Cove, Nassau County, from Baldwin's three-quarters of a mile southerly to deep water, with a view to constructing a channel 8 feet in depth at mean low water and 20 feet in width."

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, Parsonage Cove is situated on the south side of Long Island, in the town of Hempstead, Nassau County. It forms a part of a continuous line of direct communication between the creek to the north and the bay to the south.

There is a good depth of water in the creek which flows into this cove and thence to the bay, but through one cause or another Parsonage Cove has filled up with mud and is now not suited to carry the commerce of its surrounding country. Parsonage Cove or Channel has been dredged several times by private subscription, to allow the passage of steamers and vessels engaged in the oyster and produce trade; but, as already stated, it has within recent years gradually filled up to the extent that where formerly there was a depth of 8 feet of water there is now perhaps not to exceed 3 feet, all of which has resulted in a great loss of business to the citizens of Baldwin and neighboring sections who are engaged in supplying the markets of New York with fish, oysters, and other products and in transporting from New York for local consumption such fertilizers, produce, and other items consumed in this community.

The country in the neighborhood of Parsonage Cove has developed greatly within the past few years, and would develop further if the people of that section were given the benefits of competing transportation enterprises. The railroad at the present time affords the only means of carrying products to market. The rates are high and the profits of the people correspondingly reduced.

The dredging of a channel through Parsonage Cove which would

enable the passage of vessels drawing 6 and 7 feet of water would justify itself in the returns which would be made within the space of a single year. The people of this section are liberal, public spirited, and enterprising. By private subscription they dredged this channel in the past. They are entitled now to Federal consideration, especially when so many small and unpromising waterways in remote sections, where growth will not result for decades to come, are receiving the attention of the National Government.

I appreciate the difficulties in the way of the committee, and how hard it is for them to discriminate between projects. I also realize that many concessions have to be made to a great many gentlemen on the floor of this House in order to secure their co-operation in passing legislation necessary to keep in motion our governmental machinery and to assure to us the benefits of progressive ideas and policies, without which nations of to-day, as individuals, lose their headway and are superseded by others more alert to the requirements of the times.

I trust the chairman of the committee will permit this amendment to pass. It involves but slight expense, and the enterprise, if favorably recommended by the Chief of Engineers, will not exceed in expense a few thousand dollars, three or four at the outside—certainly a bagatelle compared with the benefits which will be derived.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee tells me that if he consented to my amendment hundreds of others will be pressed upon him, and the liberality of this House, as well as of the country, abused. It is regrettable that public business is so pressing that the committee have not had time to investigate these matters that they might separate the goats from the sheep and pass judgment upon enterprises of this kind upon their merits and not in the offhand manner now practiced.

I submit my amendment to the good graces of the House, trusting the people of this section of my constituency will receive the recognition and consideration to which they are justly entitled.

River and Harbor Bill—Jacksons Creek.

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 16, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read an amendment to this bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at end of line 4, page 93, the following:

"Jacksons Creek, Nassau County, from Bellmore Dock to the bay, with a view to constructing a channel therein 6 feet in depth at mean low water and 150 feet in width."

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, Jacksons Creek is situated on the south shore of Long Island, in the county recently erected out of the eastern end of old Queens County, and known as Nassau. It runs through a farming section of country, and is the natural outlet to the Great South Bay for a considerable agricultural and fishing population.

At the present time this waterway is unavailable at certain times for public use. By dredging and deepening it to the depth and width called for in my amendment a section of country will be opened up, resulting in increased agricultural activity fully justifying the enterprise.

The village of Bellmore extends to this creek. It is an active community, with excellent possibilities before it, when afforded the benefits which will naturally follow a development of its waterway to the bay, and ultimately to New York. Competition in transportation is unknown in this section at the present time. With increased water facilities the freight rates on the railroad will be decreased to meet the competition of water transportation, and benefits will result to every class of the population of this section.

The survey which is asked will involve but slight cost to the Government. I have every reason to believe a favorable report will be made by the engineers when they come to give this locality expert attention.

I hope the chairman of the committee can see his way clear to accept the amendment. I submit it in good faith for the consideration of the House.

The Late Representative John H. Hoffecker.

SPEECH
OF
HON. CYRUS A. SULLOWAY,
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Saturday, February 16, 1901.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:
"Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tribute to the memory of Hon. JOHN H. HOFFECKER, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Delaware.
"Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a distinguished public servant, the House, at the conclusion of these exercises, shall stand adjourned.
"Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.
"Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased."

Mr. SULLOWAY said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The grim reaper with his unseen but mighty power has reaped a rich harvest in the past two years among the members of this House. Many men have been gathered silently in and have passed into that mysterious beyond. As we stand today and look back at the past the forms of our departed friends and associates seem to rise before us, and their brilliant careers, their ennobling qualities, and their sterling characters stand as beacon lights to guide us safely through the tempestuous seas of life. Their lives, pure, honest, and upright, ever remind us that—

Death loves a shining mark.

Of all those who have been called and are now sleeping the last sleep there are none whom we shall miss more or whose memory we will hold dearer than our friend and departed associate Hon. JOHN HENRY HOFFECKER, late a member of Congress from the State of Delaware. Although he had passed the allotted three score and ten, he was full of life, active and alert, a man of splendid physique and noble attainments. The cares of life had rested lightly upon him. His face had almost the freshness of youth, and his step was elastic as that of a young man.

I shall always look back with pleasure upon my acquaintance with the late Congressman HOFFECKER, for it was a pleasure and an inspiration to know him as I have known him. Associated as I was with him on the Committee on Invalid Pensions, I came in contact with him almost daily, and learned to know him well and to appreciate his splendid qualities. To know him was to love and admire him, for he was a most companionable man, being always genial, courteous, and affable. He was exceedingly prompt in his attendance at all meetings of the committee, and took great interest in the work that came before him.

While he was quiet, unostentatious, modest, and unassuming in his manners, it did not take those associated with him long to discover that he was possessed of sound judgment, good sense, and great logic. His advice and counsel always commanded the greatest respect, and his views carried much weight. He was honest, fearless, and candid in his opinions, and always stood unflinchingly for that which he believed to be right. He was a man of deeds rather than of words, and measured his efforts by the results he obtained.

JOHN HENRY HOFFECKER was a man who could but command the respect of every man he came in contact with. His kindly face and pleasing ways attracted all to him. It is no cause for wonder that he occupied a high position in his native State and was honored and loved by his constituency. It was but a just tribute to his sterling manhood and true Christian character.

In politics Mr. HOFFECKER was an active and earnest Republican, and was one of the "Old Guard" of that political faith in Delaware. He was a delegate to the Republican national convention in 1876, and again at Chicago in 1884. He was elected to the State legislature of Delaware in 1888, and was honored by being chosen the speaker of the house of representatives. He held many other positions of honor and trust in that State, and to every public trust he was faithful and conscientious in the discharge of his duty.

The voters of Delaware by a handsome majority elected Mr. HOFFECKER as their Representative to the Fifty-sixth Congress, and it was in the midst of a useful and honorable career that his life was closed by death. Mr. HOFFECKER was one of the sturdy and substantial citizens of this great country of ours, one of the bone and sinew, one of the tried and true. He was true to himself and true to his friends. He was popular with his associates on the committee and with the members of this House.

His death came as a shock to us all, and while the loss was greater to his family circle and long personal friends, and to the State which he so ably represented, it was also great to this legis-

lative body, and especially to the committee of which he was such an active and honored member. No man would have been more missed from its deliberations, and it fills our hearts with sorrow and sadness when we think that never again will we look into his frank and honest face, or never again hear the tones of his pleasant and cheering voice. Truly, he was one of nature's noblemen and one for whom we shall all sincerely mourn.

River and Harbor Bill.

SPEECH
OF
HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,
OF NEW YORK,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Wednesday, January 9, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The present river and harbor bill makes large appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors. Whether these appropriations are excessive, for lack of time to investigate I can not say. In my judgment it should be the settled policy of this Government to improve, when necessary for the purposes of promoting commerce, all navigable waters of the United States, for the reason that water transportation invariably brings about a reduction in freight rates on the part of the railroads ranging anywhere from 5 per cent upward. A freight steamer at any competing point is an assurance that freight rates will be properly adjusted.

Manufacturing interests are very shy about locating where they have not reasonable assurance of competitive freight rates. The district which I have the honor of representing in the Congress possesses unusual advantages for the establishment of various manufacturing interests, which would give profitable employment to a much larger population than Long Island now possesses, and would add at once and very materially to the wealth of my constituents. Many efforts have been made to induce capital and manufacturing interests to settle upon Long Island, but as a rule these efforts have met with poor success. I have felt the difficulty perhaps was to be found in the fact that while we boast of beautiful bays and harbors, yet many of them, for lack of proper improvement, are not available for water transportation, and thus do not assure to capital seeking factory sites suitable navigable waterways and the reasonable freight rates that are consequent upon competition.

It may be the past policy of the Long Island Railroad has been in some degree to blame for our failure to develop in proportion to our natural advantages, although the fault can hardly be laid upon a company that is compelled to run trains at a loss over more than a hundred miles of territory during more than six months of the year. Before its recent purchase by the Pennsylvania Railroad the Long Island Railroad was not in a position to incur a heavy loss for an indefinite number of years by affording cheaper rates and more frequent service between New York and the eastern end of the island.

Had the old company enjoyed in the past the financial support now behind it, there might have been an ultimate growth of an industrial population large enough to make increased service profitable, but in the past the financial condition of the road has not been such as to make enterprise of this kind possible. While I share the hope that the new management of the road will use their great resources to embark upon the desired departure, the result of which must bring to the people of Long Island better opportunities to increase in material welfare, I also feel these desirable ends will be assisted by suitable improvement of the island's waterways.

It must be admitted that one factor which militates against the industrial development of Long Island is the constantly increasing tendency of wealthy New Yorkers to buy up large tracts of land in the near-by sections of the island for country residences. These tracts, which might be the most profitable alike for farming and manufacturing purposes, are withdrawn from both. The value of this element in Long Island life is not to be underestimated, but from a commercial standpoint it is not an unmingled blessing.

It is said there are items in this bill that should not have been put there. That has always been the case with such bills, and will continue to be until the upward trend of the nation eliminates selfishness from the American character. So far as my district is concerned, I feel that every item in the bill will stand the

closest scrutiny. My criticism of the committee in making up the bill is a criticism for acts of omission rather than of commission, and I am rather inclined to the opinion that failure on the part of the committee to act favorably in regard to certain matters in which the people of my section of the country are interested is due rather to a lack of knowledge of the importance of the questions involved than from any disposition to ignore our just claims.

I appreciate that it is necessary for the committee, in order to secure votes for the really national and urgently needed improvements in rivers and harbors, to make concessions to Congressmen who demand money for improvements that, if made at all, should be accomplished by local enterprise; and in this connection—I say it advisedly—there is no project in my district provided for in this bill which does not fall within the scope of Federal consideration.

To meet the charge that this bill carries exorbitant appropriations for our largest harbors, such as New York and Boston, permit me to say, Mr. Chairman, that there are very important reasons for increased appropriations to facilitate their commerce. Channels that were deep enough for the largest ships of recent years are not navigable for the much larger ships now employed. This necessitates heavy expenditures on rivers and harbors where heretofore no such necessity existed. If the tendency toward great ships goes on, these appropriations will continue to grow.

I am not in favor of extravagance of any kind. I would like to see all expenditures based on broad national grounds. But the worst extravagance is often labeled "economy." Refusal to make adequate appropriations at the proper time has cost the taxpayers more millions than can be charged to the account of excessive liberality.

The assertion that most of the Congressmen are in favor of squandering the people's money "on 'improvements' that are not needed" is one of those pessimistic utterances thoughtlessly thrown off. From personal experience I have learned, even during my very brief membership in this body, that with the average Congressman the chief difficulty lies in deciding which of many really meritorious plans for public improvements the country can afford to undertake first. He knows that more millions are needed than we have on hand or ought to raise. He knows, for example, that it would be good policy for the Government to construct instead of renting buildings in scores, if not in hundreds, of localities. He knows that huge as the river and harbor bill of this year is, there are rivers and harbors on which much more than they get could be expended profitably. He knows that in this immense and comparatively young country there are necessities for expenditure far in excess of the money available. He knows, too, that great as has been the increased outlay by Congress, our increase in wealth has been greater.

Mr. Chairman, disparagement of Congress is disparagement of the people. If it were the habit of Congress to squander billions or millions or thousands upon objects which had no merit—to revel in the delight of squandering—it would be a serious matter. It would mean, among other things, that our plan of government had signally failed. But we all know that it has been a magnificent success.

Still it is not unlikely that the record-breaking expenditures of the Fifty-sixth Congress will play an important part in the Congressional elections of 1902.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation of public money for the improvement of rivers and harbors, like the protection of American industries, is a doctrine inherited from the Whigs and developed by the Republican party. The old Democratic doctrine opposed all Federal aid to internal improvements, for the reason that it tended to paternalism and greed. In more recent years the trend of public sentiment, thought, and legislation has been in the direction of liberal appropriations for internal improvements, until now, under the "general welfare" clause of the Constitution, it is accepted as the duty of Congress to make appropriations for the improvement of our harbors and navigable rivers. A distinguished gentleman in the debate on this bill said:

Where commerce is, where harbors are, where the great commerce-bearing rivers flow, there the money must be spent on improvements.

In a general way this statement must be indorsed, with the qualification, however, that wherever the conditions are such that, provided improvements are made, corresponding benefits to commerce will follow, the work of improvement should be commenced at the earliest possible moment. These conditions exist in the section of our country which it is my privilege to represent.

Many of our important harbors and greatest commerce-bearing rivers have been made such by the expenditures upon them of the National Government. It will not do to say that waterways which are capable of improvement should not be improved because their annual commerce at the present time is insignificant.

The true test is as I have stated. Further than this, it does not

follow that all the commerce along a harbor is transported on the same, either before or after the improvement is made. In this enlightened age of progress and development commerce and transportation, for healthy growth and prosperous development, are inseparably connected in every line of business; therefore it follows that equal freight rates are essential to enable the business man, whether he be a merchant, manufacturer, or farmer, to compete with others situated as he is.

It is a fact that railroad freights, as a rule, are arbitrary when uninfluenced by competition or Government supervision, and nothing now tends to lower freight rates more than the competition which invariably follows where water transportation is assured a community in addition to railroad transportation.

Of course it was not intended by our forefathers that the money belonging to the people, derived from taxation, should be distributed for the benefit of local interests, but appropriations made for improvements which will promote commerce are beneficial to the people of the country at large; therefore are wise and justifiable.

Mr. Chairman, I protest against appropriations for great national projects which confer great national benefits being charged to the account of individual States. During the debate upon the pending bill attention has been called to the large appropriations which will go to certain States—to my State among others. The complaints against the appropriations for New York Harbor are well answered by the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ALEXANDER], that the exports and imports passing through that great city are more than double the exports and imports of the 28 States that are not represented on the River and Harbor Committee. But these exports and imports are not for New York alone, as was well said by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

The great streams of commerce that pour their treasures into the harbors of New York are formed and filled by rivulets having their sources in every hamlet, in every home, in every camp, in every portion of the land, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. It is the commerce of our entire country. There is not a woodman in any forest, a plowman in any valley, a herder upon any plain who does not with every stroke of the ax, with the turning of every furrow, at every movement of his camp, contribute something to build up the great wealth of commerce that flows through the harbor of the metropolis of the United States.

We can not by one stroke, in any one way, better provide for the commerce of the entire land than by suitable appropriations to deepen the harbor of the city of New York. If the 17 States represented on the River and Harbor Committee receive 75 per cent of the appropriations, 80 per cent of the commerce of the entire country passes through the rivers and harbors of those States, the improvements of which are provided for in this bill.

My colleague from New York (Mr. ALEXANDER) says that the value of our exports and imports during the ten months ending October 31, 1900, amounted to \$1,889,737,066; that of this amount \$1,445,414,000, or nearly 80 per cent, passed through the ports of the States represented by the members of the River and Harbor Committee; that the total vessel tonnage, both steam and sail, engaged in the foreign trade of the United States during the year ending June 30, 1899, amounted to 52,376,792 tons.

Of this sum only 15,000,000, or about 29 per cent, enter and clear from ports of the 28 States not represented on the River and Harbor Committee, while nearly 75 per cent of the tonnage of the country passed in and out of ports represented on the River and Harbor Committee. More than 80 per cent of all customs duties are paid at ports in these States. The total number of vessels, both steam and sail, engaged in foreign commerce and entering and clearing from the ports of the United States during the year ending June 30, 1899, was 64,202. Of this number only 17,000, or 26 per cent, entered and cleared from ports within the States not represented upon the River and Harbor Committee.

From this summary it will be observed that an average of about 75 per cent of the commerce of the United States belongs to the States represented on this committee, and only about 25 per cent to the remaining 28 States.

The appropriations provided in this bill bear the rates of about 75 to 25 in favor of the 17 States collecting the 80 per cent of the customs duties paid the United States.

These facts are a complete refutation of the charge that the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee have been unduly generous to their own States.

Nothing has contributed more to make the nineteenth century the greatest of all the centuries than improvements in transportation. These improvements have not only brought nations and States nearer together, but they have made possible the enjoyment of a far greater share of the necessities, comforts, and luxuries of life. Increased facilities for transportation have greatly increased production and consumption, because except for these

improvements a large share of that which is now annually consumed could not be brought within the reach of the consumer. Thus increase of production and transportation must go hand in hand.

But for the improvements in distributive energy a very large share of that which is now produced could not reach the consumer.

No country has gained greater benefits from improvement in transportation than our own. They have afforded a stimulus to our industry; they have made possible the development of our mines, our forests, and our farms, and made available the enormous supplies which can be used for consumption all over the globe. We must, in order to continue this progress, improve our facilities for transportation by both land and water. Not to continue these improvements is to fall backward. A distinctive feature of this bill is the provision made for deeper waterways and larger harbors, where already large traffic exists, and increased facilities are made necessary by the deeper draft and larger size of vessels.

These proposed improvements will aid the producers of the whole country and be a national benefit. It is largely the great increase of our export trade which has brought prosperity to our people and happiness to our homes. We want to increase our export trade. If we are to control the markets of the world, we should make every effort to put our goods into those markets at the lowest possible price. Therefore diminution of the cost of transportation becomes a factor of great importance. It is the increase in the size of our steamers which has brought about a decrease in the cost of transportation, and it is because of such increase in size that our harbors must be provided with wider and deeper channels.

Twenty-five years ago steamers sailing from our Atlantic ports were of 2,500 tons weight, from 300 to 400 feet long, and drew from 18 to 20 feet of water. Then the rates of freight were from 16 to 20 cents a bushel for grain, and other freight in that proportion.

Ten years later steamers were of double the size, with a capacity of 5,000 tons weight. Rates of freight were reduced 50 per cent. Instead of 16 to 20 cents a bushel for grain, the rate was from 8 to 10 cents. To-day there are steamers of over 14,000 tons weight, over 600 feet long, and drawing 35 feet of water. As a direct consequence freight rates were again reduced, and are to-day one-quarter of the rate which existed in 1875, so that grain can be shipped to Liverpool at 5 cents per bushel.

The producers of cotton in the South pay from 50 cents to \$1 per bale instead of from \$2.50 to \$3. The cost of transportation for cattle, provisions, and all kinds of freight has been decreased in proportion. If we have a great surplus of grain, the prices we get for the surplus fixes the price for the whole crop. It needs little argument to show that it is the producer who gets the benefit of a decrease in the cost of transportation. It is in the interest of the whole people that our great seaports be improved to meet every demand upon them.

Mr. Chairman, what I have endeavored to establish is the fact that vessels for the transportation of products can carry more cheaply in proportion to their enlarged size. The records of the past few years tend to show that competition of trade is leading every day to an increased tonnage, to larger ships, and a demand for a greater draft. The same rule seems to apply to ships of war. The safety and defense of nations require larger ships, greater drafts, and the easiest possible access to the sea.

In Europe vast sums have been expended on public works of this character. Projects of this sort have received the most liberal bounty of great nations. Such improvements are the pride and glory of European civilization. There have been created in Europe harbors for commerce and refuge where none existed.

There is no occasion as yet to advocate such a policy in this country. I refer to it only to show to what extremes our rivals have gone to promote commerce, and also to justify my contention that it is the duty of Congress to legislate to improve the navigation of the waterways of the country in the interest of commerce—that great subject which has been placed exclusively under its jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, in this bill by the appropriation, or authorization of an appropriation of eighteen hundred thousand dollars, provision is made for the deepening of Buttermilk Channel, a subsidiary channel of New York, whereby vessels will be enabled to reach that portion of Brooklyn where are located the largest and the greatest number of New York's warehouses. This channel also facilitates the movement of vessels from New York Bay to the East River. Buttermilk Channel is one of the important thoroughfares of the port of New York. It is now dangerously shallow. The ocean liners which frequent it are compelled to wait for high tide, and thus often until untimely and inconvenient hours of sailing before they can venture down it.

Even then it is not uncommon for them to graze the bottom, and there is always the disquieting knowledge that there are at

best only a few inches of water beneath the keel, and that a deviation of a few score feet to one side or the other might send the ship against a serious obstruction. It is not, of course, to be pretended that there is danger of actual shipwreck in Buttermilk Channel, but if a vessel grazes bottom ever so lightly, there is no telling but that a seam may be opened, a plate loosened, or some rivets broken, with danger of the development of serious trouble before the voyage is ended. There is no one who would not feel a degree of anxiety after such an incident until the vessel was again in port and safely docked. It is discreditable, to say the least, that costly ocean steamships, loaded with passengers and valuable cargoes, should be subjected to such inconvenience and actual peril every time they enter or leave the harbor of New York.

Mr. Chairman, Buttermilk Channel passes in front of the wharves of Brooklyn, from Gowanus Bay to Brooklyn Bridge. In that section are the docks and elevators that assist in taking care of much of the tremendous volume of commerce entering Greater New York.

Of little use would be the new channel, 2,000 feet wide and 40 feet deep, provided for in the bill of 1899 by the appropriation or authorization of \$1,000,000, if vessels were unable to reach wharves after entering the bay. If a new outer channel is needed to admit the great boats—twelve, thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen thousand tons burden—other interior channels are needed to take them to the upper harbor, their wharves, and warehouses.

Mr. Chairman, national appropriations for the improvement of New York Harbor have always been pitifully meager in contrast with those made for other places, notwithstanding the fact that the improvements sought have never been for the local benefit of New York any more than for the general good of the trade and travel of the whole country. The demand is urgent that this indispensable channel of the nation's chief harbor be made safely accessible to the mercantile navies of the world. This demand is so eminently reasonable that it should be granted without opposition.

If the House will examine with care this project, it will perceive that it is not a matter of local interest, but of national concern, and that at least two departments of the Government have a direct and considerable interest in the enlargement of that neglected waterway. We have had repeated demonstrations, some of them comparatively recent, of the risk of taking large warships through the narrow and always overcrowded channel between the Battery and Governors Island, which is now the only practicable way into or out of the East River for large vessels. The deepening of Buttermilk Channel to 40 feet, with a width of 1,200 feet, would give to the largest battle ships a safe and convenient deep-water approach to the navy-yard.

Fighting ships are instruments of emergency, as to which it is a primary condition that they be ever ready to meet their emergencies. A battle ship that is or may be stationed at the Brooklyn Navy-Yard, from which the only way out to sea lies through a channel beset with perpetual perils of collision and grounding on troublesome reefs, can not be counted on as ready for everything at all times.

The War Department is considering plans for the improvement of the water front of Governors Island. The wharves and other improvements it has in mind for the easterly side of the island should not be undertaken until the limits of the Buttermilk Channel widening and deepening have been determined. The two improvements ought to be carried on simultaneously.

The commerce of the port of New York demands the improvement of this important waterway as the logical continuation of the deep channel down the harbor, work on which will soon begin under the appropriation of the last Congress. It would be an inexcusable waste of natural opportunity to confine the benefits of that great Government undertaking solely to the North River side of Manhattan Island. It was demonstrated at the time of the burning of the Hoboken piers of the North German Lloyd Line that Buttermilk Channel in its present condition is not practicable for large ocean-going steamers. Yet it would seem to be a reasonable commercial proposition that the great warehouses that line the Brooklyn water front opposite the lower end of Manhattan Island should be accessible to big as well as little ocean vessels. The whole East River will be opened to all the ships of the sea when this channel is opened, and not till then. I concede my people have a deep interest in this accomplishment.

In New York there is no voice against this improvement. The Chamber of Commerce, the Produce Exchange, the Maritime Association, the Underwriters, the Board of Trade and Transportation, and the Merchants' Association, have adopted resolutions or taken action for its execution. On the ground of commercial and national interest there is no argument to be made against it. It will not even be a costly work.

Mr. Chairman, I have been one of the persistent and importunate members who have continuously waited upon gentlemen of the River and Harbor Committee, seeking to have improvements and appropriations for my district included in this bill.

I have not received recognition to the extent I desired nor, as I believe, to the extent of the needs of my constituency, but I realize the fact that if the demands of every member had been met and all the recommendations of the engineers had been followed by appropriations in the amounts recommended, the aggregate sum appropriated by the bill would have staggered even the liberality of this House and would have subjected the committee to merited criticism. I think I appreciate some of the difficulties which confronted the committee, with propositions aggregating over \$300,000,000 presented to them for investigation, and I am grateful for the favor, considerations, and courtesies received at their hands.

For the benefit of those of my constituents who are not familiar with the procedure of the House, I wish to say that in order to secure a wise, economical expenditure and to make a proper choice of projects, rules were adopted whereby it became mandatory that a proposed improvement by Congressional action before an appropriation can be secured must be submitted to the Engineer Bureau of the Department of War, whose duty it becomes to examine into the project for improvement, determine whether it is possible, ascertain the commerce of the locality and the value of the proposed work to commerce, and report to Congress. The work of the local engineers and of this Bureau must be approved by the Chief of Engineers, and only then can the project come before the Congress for an appropriation.

Next a project must meet the scrutiny of a committee—generally a very able one—and last, the scrutiny of the House itself and of the Senate, the test of debate and of public criticism, including the public press. This does not insure abstract perfection in every item, but where will you find a better system and better securities against mistake, error, or fraud in any of the factors which go to make up a great appropriation bill?

Mr. Chairman, the items in this bill chargeable to my district in so far as such improvements can be charged to a given section, and the amounts by this bill appropriated therefor, are as follows:

Improving Sag Harbor, New York, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 77, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, \$10,000.

Improving harbor at Mattituck, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

Improving harbor at Port Jefferson Inlet, New York: For maintenance, \$8,000.

Improving harbor at Huntington, N. Y.: Completing improvement, \$2,500.

Improving harbor at Canarsie Bay, New York: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$10,000.

Improving harbor at Glen Cove, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$7,000.

Improving harbor at Flushing Bay, New York: For maintenance, \$5,000.

Improving Patchogue River and Bay, New York: In accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 103, Fifty-sixth Congress, second session, \$20,000.

Improving Newtown Creek, New York: For maintenance, \$7,500.

Improving Browns Creek, Sayville, Long Island, N. Y.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$3,000.

Improving East River and Hell Gate, New York: Continuing improvement, \$200,000.

Mr. Chairman, I am not blind to the difficulties in the way of amending the present bill. I know the danger to the bill if the chairman of the committee [Mr. BURTON] consents to any material amendment. I appreciate he can not favor one amendment and one member of the House and refuse another amendment and another member of the House. It is to me apparent that at this state of proceeding it is impossible to have proposed amendments considered upon their merits.

Therefore I feel constrained to accept the appropriations which have been allowed to me, though falling far behind the needs of my constituents and what I consider to be my constituents' just deserts, confident in the belief that the committee, guided in its deliberations by its able, courteous chairman, have given careful, intelligent, and conscientious attention to the projects which have been urged upon them, and have endeavored earnestly to determine the relative importance of the items presented for incorporation in this bill, and to allow to each the most liberal appropriation circumstances would permit. I know they have reached their conclusions, if erroneous, through errors of judgment only.

Mr. Chairman, all the projects in this bill chargeable to my district are meritorious and will, upon investigation, recommend themselves to the favorable consideration of every member of the House. I trust there will be no further opposition to any of them, and that the appropriations they call for will be allowed. [Applause.]

Storage Reservoirs—The Arid-Land Question.

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS,

OF NEVADA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 9, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. NEWLANDS said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors was speaking I interrogated him regarding the following item: "Reservoirs at the head waters of the Mississippi River: For continuing improvement, \$300,000." I asked him what purpose those reservoirs served. His answer was that they were supposed to serve the interests of navigation; that they were on the head waters of the Mississippi and were intended to increase the flow of the water during the summer season, but that in his judgment legislation with reference to this matter had been unwise and inefficient to accomplish the purpose intended. I have since inquired of the gentleman who represents Minnesota, and he informs me that for a distance of nearly 200 miles the flow of this river is materially increased by these reservoirs, that the water is 8 inches higher than it otherwise would be, and you all know what that means with flat-bottomed boats on the head waters of these great rivers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is the view of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that the appropriations reported by that committee should be confined entirely to navigation and that no items relating to irrigation should be inserted in a river and harbor bill. I submit that this is a narrow view of the jurisdiction enjoyed by this committee. The rules of the House refer to that committee all bills relating to the improvement of rivers, and I submit that a public work on a river, whether with a view to promoting navigation or irrigation, is an improvement of a river, and that the committee has jurisdiction of the subject-matter. This view has been taken by the Senate upon numerous occasions, and two years ago the Senate conferees strenuously though unsuccessfully insisted upon an amendment to the river and harbor bill which was intended to provide for the construction of reservoirs at the head waters of the Missouri River, with a view of producing a steadier flow of that river to the Mississippi, into which it emptied. The interests of both navigation and irrigation can oftentimes be met by the same improvement.

RIVER IMPROVEMENTS.

What improvements are required in our rivers? In the first place the navigable rivers are subject to floods, and we seek to prevent the overflow by constructing levees. Immense sums have been expended on the lower part of the Mississippi in an effort to confine the stream and to prevent overflow of the adjoining land. Another character of improvement is the dredging of the rivers for the purpose of meeting the period of drought in the summer when the rivers are low and when bars and shallows obstruct navigation. The flow of the lower Mississippi is increased by the flow of the rivers tributary to it. Some of them, like the Ohio, taking their source in the humid regions, and others, like the Missouri, the Arkansas, and the Platte, taking their source in the arid regions from the snows of the mountains, and it is contended that by storing the flood waters in the mountain regions, caused by the rapid melting of the snows in the Spring, a large proportion of the flood in the Missouri and the Mississippi rivers can be prevented and a more equal and sustained flow of the rivers thus promoted.

UNDERGROUND STORAGE.

It should be remembered that the waters stored in these reservoirs are not the only waters which will be held back during the flood seasons. The character of all the mountain streams in the arid region is that they are torrential during April, May, and June and that they are reduced to almost nothing in the following months. Large areas of arid land lie within reach of these streams, but the condition of the flow during the hot months of July, August, and September limits the area of reclamation; for whilst the waters of the early spring and summer months is sufficient for the requirements of vast areas of land, yet if the waters were diverted over them and crops were planted, they would lack water at the period of greatest want when the crops were ripening for harvest.

The storage of water above enables a larger utilization of the

flood waters which are unstored, and storage insures a supply during the period of greatest drought. The result would be that for every acre-foot of flood water stored there would be four or five acre-feet of flood water taken out over the arid lands, thus diminishing the flow of the streams tributary to the Missouri and Mississippi during the torrential period, and these great plains, now arid, would themselves be made the storage reservoirs of vast quantities of flood waters which would otherwise rush down to the Mississippi, so that the effectual storage will not be confined simply to the artificial reservoirs, but will be extended to these large areas of land which will be reclaimed and which will absorb annually a volume of water at least two feet deep over the entire surface. The diversion and overflow of flood waters over the arid lands above would diminish the overflow in the Lower Mississippi and would diminish the cost of the levees intended for protection of the adjoining lands. The water carried over the arid lands above would penetrate the soil and would seep gradually back to the rivers and keep the streams below fuller during the hot months than they would be had not this water been diverted or stored. Thus a saving will be effected in the dredging of the shallows intended to relieve as against low water as well as in the construction of the levees intended to relieve as against flood water.

RESERVOIRS ABOVE INSTEAD OF LEVEES BELOW.

We contend that by the construction of storage reservoirs at the head waters of these rivers in the Rocky Mountains a large proportion of the expenditures for levees on the Lower Mississippi will be saved and that a more equal flow of the main river will be maintained, and thus the expense of dredging during the hot season will be greatly diminished. Navigation, like irrigation, requires that the streams should maintain an equal flow; that they should not be torrents at one season and attenuated threads at another.

The evils which attach to both navigation and irrigation are the same, viz, that the streams are overflowing at a time when the water is not needed and they are attenuated threads at a time when the water is most in demand; and we of the arid regions contend that both navigation and irrigation can be promoted by the storing of these waters at the sources of these mountain streams which are tributary to the great navigable rivers.

We also contend, even assuming that the river and harbor bill should be confined to improvements essential to navigation, that the proper place for appropriations for storage reservoirs on the rivers tributary to our navigable rivers is in the river and harbor bill, as they tend to promote navigation, although having a very much larger value in the promotion of irrigation.

NONNAVIGABLE RIVERS.

But all the rivers in the arid region are not tributaries to navigable rivers. Upon what theory, then, should the Government proceed to store water on such rivers? Our contention is that irrigation is a public use, just as navigation is; that it is subject to the control of the law, and that the Congress of the United States, under the "general welfare" clause of the Constitution, can do anything in the way of internal improvement that is calculated to promote the general welfare, and that the general welfare is promoted by maintaining an equal and sustained flow of a stream for irrigation as well as by maintaining it for navigation.

Besides this, the United States Government is the owner of 600,000,000 acres of land in the arid region, of which 100,000,000 acres can be reclaimed by a gradual process of storage extending over fifty or one hundred years. The reclamation of these lands will make more valuable the remaining pastoral lands, which are now used in common by all the stock-raising interests in the West. The Government undoubtedly has the power to look after its own property—to survey it, to mark it by section posts, and to put it in condition for settlement and sale; and if the maintenance of an equal flow in the rivers running through its lands is essential in order to enable its lands to be reclaimed by settlers, it can take such measures as it deems advisable for the purpose of making the waters available to settlers.

Large areas of lands along these rivers have already been taken up by settlers, and they have been able to solve the easy problems of irrigation, consisting simply in the diversion of the waters over the adjoining lands, but they are not able to control the torrential flow which has its source perhaps hundreds of miles away from those settlements, nor have they been able to store the water so as to maintain the supply during the hot season of July and August, when water is essential to the ripening of the crops. The limit of reclamation and settlement has been reached unless the Federal Government, acting, as it can, without regard to State lines, makes a scientific study of each river and its tributaries and so stores the water as to prevent the torrential flow in the spring and to increase the scanty flow in the summer. By doing this its arid lands will be made available for settlers, and it can, if it chooses, secure compensation by a charge upon the lands.

ULTIMATE COST.

It is estimated that there are about 600,000,000 acres of arid public lands in the West, and of this about 100,000,000 acres can

be reclaimed if storage is afforded. It is also estimated that the storage of water will cost from \$2 to \$10 per acre-foot; the average probably would be about \$5 per acre-foot. The cheaper forms of storage would doubtless be attempted first, and the more expensive forms of storage would only be taken up years hence, when the pressure of population and the increased value of the lands would warrant the expenditure.

A convenient argument against the immediate prosecution of this work is that we have no estimate of its ultimate cost. Our answer is that if the Government had halted at the threshold of any great public work for inquiry as to what the prosecution of like work would cost within one hundred years, the estimate would probably have paralyzed the action of Congressional bodies. For instance, when the first river and harbor bill was introduced, suppose some captious member of Congress had demanded a halt until it could be ascertained what the total cost over a period of one hundred years would be. I imagine that the statement, verified subsequently by events, that in one hundred years nearly \$400,000,000 would be expended on the river and harbor bill would have staggered the imagination, and yet this amount has been expended and the country has not felt it.

It is impossible to forecast the future and state exactly what the storage in the arid regions will cost; but assuming that 100,000,000 acres of land are to be reclaimed; that this land on an average will require annually 200,000,000 acre-feet of water, and that at least four-fifths of this will be supplied by the flood stream, and that one-fifth will be supplied by the stored water, we will require within the next fifty or one hundred years a storage capacity equal to 40,000,000 acre-feet of water—that is to say, a storage equal to covering 40,000,000 acres 1 foot deep, or 1,000,000 acres 40 feet deep. Assuming that the average cost of this would be \$5 per acre-foot, the total cost would be within a period of fifty or one hundred years about \$200,000,000.

Expenditures of the settlers upon their lands would far exceed this; it would probably average from \$10 to \$40 or \$50 per acre, dependent upon the cost of the main canals, the level or broken character of the ground, and the difficulty in leading out the water from the river. But one thing is assured, and that is that every acre of land reclaimed would be worth at least \$50, and, as 100,000,000 acres are to be reclaimed, we would have a total increase in the wealth of the country in land alone, without improvements, of \$5,000,000,000 by the expenditure upon the part of the Government of \$200,000,000, and we would have a country opened up for the surplus population of the East and the middle Western States.

FORM OF IRRIGATION LEGISLATION.

There are two ways of legislating upon this work. One is to pass annually a bill similar to the river and harbor bill, providing, first, for the construction of projects which have been surveyed, estimated, and reported favorably, and, second, making appropriations for surveys, estimates, and reports as to projects that are contemplated. Such appropriations would come out of the National Treasury and would be raised from general taxation, just as the appropriations in the river and harbor bill are.

Another method would be to fasten the cost of the Government work of storage upon the public lands susceptible of reclamation. Such a plan would involve the creation of an arid land reclamation fund in the Treasury, into which all moneys received from the sales of public lands in the arid and semiarid States would go. The receipts from the sales of public lands last year amounted to about \$3,000,000, and including commissions and fees, to \$4,000,000. So the sum available for the first year would be about \$4,000,000. Provision should be made for investigation, surveys, estimates, and reports by the Geological Survey of various projects, and upon approval of a project by the Secretary of the Interior he should be authorized to withdraw from entry the lands in the reservoir sites and to withdraw from entry, except under the homestead act, all land susceptible of irrigation by reason of such project. He should then be given power to contract for the work; no contract to be made unless the money is in the fund. When the project is completed the total cost should be ascertained, and the price of the lands susceptible of irrigation and of the water rights attached thereto should be so fixed as to compensate the fund in ten annual installments, thus maintaining the perpetuity of the fund for progressive work.

If the report should show that lands already settled required stored water, power should be given the Secretary of the Interior to sell water rights to such settlers upon the same terms as to new settlers. Right of entry under the law should be limited to 80 acres, and the sale of the water right to existing settlers should be limited to an amount sufficient for 80 acres; the purpose of this being not only to prevent the creation of monopoly in the lands now belonging to the Government, but to break up existing land monopoly in the West by making it to the interest of the owner of a large tract of land made more valuable by the possibility of securing stored water to divide up his land and sell to actual settlers. The bill should be so framed as to make its operation

automatic, progressive, and complete, to guard against improvident projects, to prevent land monopoly, to secure homes for actual settlers, and to promote the division of the large tracts of land which, under the unfortunate administration of State and national laws, have been created in the West.

Under this plan the West would reclaim itself without calling upon the general taxpayers for a dollar.

CESSION TO THE STATES.

It has been suggested that the cession of the arid lands to the States would produce the same results, and would relieve the Federal Government of a great work. My answer to this is that the Government has no right to abdicate the great trust imposed upon it by the ownership of 600,000,000 acres of land, upon which the homes of unborn millions are to be made. It can not afford to intrust these lands either to the ignorance, the improvidence, or the dishonesty of local legislatures. The experience of all the Western States has been that the grants of land made by the Federal Government to the States for the purpose of education or local improvement have been maladministered and have resulted in the concentration of immense holdings of land in single ownership.

This country has to-day 70,000,000 of people; within one hundred years it will have 300,000,000 people. The pressure for land will be great. Imagine the discontent and disturbance which will result from an improvident administration of these great areas easily capable of supporting 100,000,000 people.

PHYSICAL CONDITIONS ARE AGAINST CESSION.

Besides this, the physical conditions are such as to prevent States from dealing with this question. The arid region must be considered as a unit, regardless of State lines. Each unit should be a main river and all its tributaries. The plains to be watered may be in one State; the sources of the river which is to water them, and the only available sites for reservoirs, may be in an adjoining State. No State can act outside of its own boundaries, nor can it clothe its citizens with sufficient power so to do.

The National Government, by reason of its national character, is alone capable of taking hold of this interstate question and solving it. Nor can this undertaking be intrusted to private or corporate enterprise. Storage enterprises are of such magnitude as to require immense capital. Their purpose is to bring about a union of the water with the land, and no corporation can successfully operate unless it has a grant of an immense area of land. This involves all the evils of land monopoly or subjects the enterprise to all the expenses connected with promotion, bond selling, etc. The speculative element must be entirely eliminated; the purpose is to create homes for the people, to make the waters of the West available for the reclamation of arid lands by actual settlers, and to eliminate entirely the speculator and the capitalist.

NEVADA'S STATUS.

The cession of the arid lands would furnish no relief to the State of Nevada. Nevada is an impoverished State. It was brought into the Union just at the close of the civil war for the purpose of aiding in reconstruction legislation and before it had the population and wealth which is usually regarded as essential to the assumption of the burdens of statehood. It came in reluctantly. It was persuaded by the leaders of the Republican party to accept statehood as a patriotic duty. It is true Nevada has produced more mineral wealth than any other State in the Union. It has produced \$600,000,000 in gold and silver, more than one-fourteenth of the entire stock of gold and silver in the world to-day, and yet it has not profited by it; it is too near to San Francisco. The promoters of Nevada enterprises were San Franciscans and the profits went to San Francisco, where they built up stately edifices and inaugurated world-wide enterprises. But very little of that wealth was expended in anything relating to the permanent, substantial, and harmonious development of Nevada.

The railroad status also affected it unfavorably. As a rule transcontinental lines are built through uninhabited country, and then they build up that country by the promotion of settlement. The Central Pacific road was unfortunately involved in a controversy with the Government, and instead of pursuing the usual policy of building up the country which it traversed, the aim of its owners was to divert its business to the Southern Pacific, and to advance the region traversed by the Southern Pacific at the expense of the country traversed by the Central Pacific. It was contended that the Central Pacific was worthless, because it was built through a worthless State, and that Nevada was simply a good foundation for a bridge from Ogden, Utah, to California.

Then came the depressing effect of our financial legislation, which resulted in the fall of the price of silver from \$1.29 an ounce to 60 cents an ounce. You can readily understand that in mining enterprises, in which the operating expenses amount to from one-half to three-fourths of the gross receipts, a fall of over one-half in the price of the product of the mines would absolutely suspend and destroy silver mining. Prior to that time conditions were speculative. Farming itself was speculative, commercial

life was speculative. Little was done during that period of tremendous mining output in the way of building the foundation of harmonious and proportionate growth. The result is, that under all these discouraging conditions Nevada has declined in population since 1880, while the population of the other intermountain States and Territories has nearly trebled. No one who is familiar with that region can contend for a moment that Arizona is equal to Nevada in its mineral or agricultural resources, but railroad and other conditions have been better there, and that Territory has advanced from a population of 35,000 in 1880 to a population of nearly 150,000 to-day, while Nevada has declined from 65,000 to 45,000.

In addition, Nevada is in debt \$300,000. It has reached the limit of its debt under the constitution of the State. How was that debt contracted? It was contracted when it was a Territory for money borrowed by that Territory in fitting out troops for the civil war—a war claim which has constantly been recognized by the Senate of the United States, but which has been rejected by this body.

Now, assuming that cession of the lands should be made to Nevada, how could she utilize them? The only thing she could do would be to turn them over to corporations and syndicates, and we would then have a repetition of the land monopoly which now so unfortunately exists both in California and Nevada as the result of grants to those States by the Government for educational purposes—a land monopoly which in itself prevents settlement and which ultimately will create indescribable discontent.

NEVADA'S PHYSICAL CONDITIONS.

Then, again, the physical conditions of Nevada would prevent the utilization of such cession. Three of the most important rivers of the State—the Truckee, the Carson, and the Walker—have their sources in the Sierra Nevada Mountains in California. These rivers flow through the western part of the State into great lakes in the sink of the desert, where their waters lie unutilized. The problem is to prevent these waters from flowing into these lakes in the lowest part of the desert and to hold them back in the mountains above in artificial reservoirs.

The plains to be irrigated are in Nevada; the reservoir sites are in California. All the sources of the water supply of these rivers are in California. To cede the plains to Nevada and to cede these mountain lands to California would tend to absolute divorce between the water and the land, and yet these waters are useless to California as there are no plains in California on the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada Mountains. That region is entirely mountainous.

Now, the torrential flow of these rivers has increased in late years. Why? Because the Government has permitted these mountains to be denuded of their forests. The forests are the natural protectors of the great snow banks, which in themselves are natural reservoirs of water. If the forests remain, the snows melt much more gradually, and thus a more equal flow of the streams is maintained, permitting a wider extent of agriculture; but as these forests are destroyed and the snow banks are exposed to the fierce rays of the sun, the result is a great flow of water in the months of April, May, and June, and no water when it is most required. The consequence is that the lowest flow of the streams limits the area of land that can be brought under cultivation. You can not make your calculations with reference to the flood flow of the stream, because that is maintained only during the early months, and if you measure your reclamation by that flow your lands would be without water in July and August, and so it is that reclamation by private enterprise of lands adjoining these streams has been necessarily limited by their periods of lowest flow.

The problem is to prevent this water from flowing into these great lakes in the desert and to store them in the mountains in places naturally adapted for reservoirs, and thus maintain an equal flow of the streams throughout the agricultural season, instead of having a rushing torrent at one time and no water at another.

Nevada is reproached to-day because she is impoverished, and yet she is prostrated because the Federal Government has neglected its duty. Ninety-five per cent of the lands in Nevada are public lands, which pay no taxes of any kind for State or local government, and the owners of the other 5 per cent have to administer the laws and the police and the road building of the entire State. Nevada and Utah are similar in topography, in soil, and in general resources. They have an area equal to that of Spain. Spain is entirely cultivated by means of irrigation, except along the seashore. Spain supports 17,000,000 people. If a liberal policy were pursued in Nevada and Utah of preserving the forests, of conserving the flood waters, and utilizing the natural resources of those States, they could easily maintain an equal population. Within one hundred years this country will have 300,000,000 people, and the proper development of this arid country, the home of millions yet to come, should be an essential part of the governmental policy.

GOVERNMENTAL STORAGE.

Now, I ask, who should undertake this work? Who can undertake the work? The view of the people of the arid region is that this is a public work of internal improvement which ought to be undertaken by the Government of the United States. It resembles in character the old canals that were constructed years ago, or the interstate roads that were constructed by the General Government, or those improvements that have been made for a number of years in dredging our rivers and improving our harbors—public improvements intended for the general welfare; improvements from which the Government does not expect a direct reimbursement, but simply the general advantage that comes to the entire country and the general welfare from the promotion of enterprises of this kind. And inasmuch as the rivers of the arid region as a rule are not navigable rivers, and the only public use to which we can put them is irrigation, not navigation, we claim that a fair and equitable distribution of the benefits of Government requires that these streams should be maintained in equal flow by the system of reservoirs to which I have alluded.

But we also claim that this is not simply a governmental matter in the ordinary sense, but that the Government itself occupies the position of proprietor of the public lands of that vast region, and as proprietor, pursuing the usual obligations of land proprietors, it is its right and its duty to put these lands in condition for settlement. By so doing it can continue the traditional policy of the country, which has been to open up the public lands for settlement, restricting the number of acres to be granted to each individual, the purpose being to promote home building amongst a free people. And these arid lands have particular advantages for that kind of settlement; for if you will only see to it that moisture is applied to them by these artificial methods, you have the most scientific system of agriculture that can be conceived.

Mr. STEELE. Is there any timber at the head waters of those streams that would protect the banks?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Oh, yes; there are forests at the heads of these streams, though in some cases the forests have been largely cut down. Still, they protect in a great degree the streams, and our whole scheme involves not only the construction of reservoirs, but the preservation of forests by having a rational cutting of the trees instead of an indiscriminate and destructive cutting.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Allow me to state that the general character of all the mountainous regions where it is proposed that these reservoirs shall be constructed is that they are in timber. The snow which falls there is retained somewhat, yet not sufficiently retained to let it fall equally.

Mr. STEELE. I understood that that was the case generally, but I was not sure as to its being the case in Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is true of the three streams I have spoken of in the western part of the State that have their source in the Sierra Nevada Mountains. It is not true to the same extent of the Humboldt River, which takes its source in the eastern part of the State.

Now, the question is, Who should do this work? We claim that it is a matter of governmental and Federal legislation, and that in addition it is an obligation that rests upon the Government as the owner of these vast areas of public lands which can be opened up to settlement. As I was remarking, irrigation is the most scientific method of agriculture. We can not determine the amount of moisture falling from the heavens; we can not regulate it; we can not control it. There may be too much; there may be too little. But as to water that is taken from a stream by a ditch, and distributed over lands at low level, there can be an absolutely scientific adjustment of the moisture to the requirements of the soil. When you have a rich soil and a sun that is kindly, if you add the necessary moisture, you have all the conditions of a most abundant cultivation—so much so that in that region 40 acres of land properly irrigated will sustain a family better than 100 acres of land in the Middle or Western States; and under certain characters of cultivation 10 or 15 acres of land will support a family.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman sits down I should like to ask him a question. The gentleman began his remarks by reading the item in the river and harbor bill providing for the reservoirs at the head of the Mississippi River, and upon that he based the remarks which he has made. Does not the gentleman know that those reservoirs were constructed entirely for the purpose of increasing the navigability of the Mississippi River?

Mr. NEWLANDS. So I understand.

Mr. MORRIS. And therefore came within the rule laid down by the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understood the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to say that these reservoirs were provided for the purpose of promoting navigation. I have also understood, however, that they were put there for the purpose of increasing the power on that river, but I may be mistaken as to that. However that may be, I still insist that when you can join the two uses, when you can prevent the floods and increase the

equal flow of these rivers by the storage of the water, you are promoting a purpose which is within the province of a river and harbor bill.

Mr. MORRIS. I simply want to correct the impression which may have been produced by the gentleman's remarks as to the committee having gone outside of its plan of making the bill.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Oh, no; I simply called attention to the fact. The reservoirs had been constructed there, and the reservoirs which we wish will serve the same purpose as those, for they will not only promote the reclamation of arid lands, but they will also tend to the maintenance of the equal flow of the streams.

[Here the hammer fell.]

APPENDIX.

REVISED BILL.

[H. R. 14338, Fifty-sixth Congress, second session.]

In the House of Representatives, March 1, 1901. Mr. NEWLANDS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed.

A bill (H. R. 14338) to provide for the disposal of the arid public lands and to authorize the construction of reservoirs for the storage of water and other necessary irrigation works for arid-land reclamation, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all moneys received from the sale and disposal of public lands in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, excepting moneys set aside by law for educational purposes, shall be, and are hereby, reserved, set aside, and appropriated as a special fund in the Treasury, to be known as the "arid-land-reclamation fund," for the examination, survey, and construction of reservoirs and other irrigation works for the storage, diversion, and development of waters, so that the same may be available for distribution by settlers and farmers for the reclamation of arid and semiarid lands, and for the payment of all disbursements provided for in this act: *Provided,* That in case the receipts from the sales of public lands, other than those realized from the sales of lands provided for in this section, are insufficient to meet the requirements for the support of agricultural colleges in the several States and Territories, the deficiency in the sum necessary for the support of the said colleges shall be provided from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior, by means of the Director of the Geological Survey, he, and he hereby is, directed to continue the examination of that portion of the arid and semiarid regions of the United States where agriculture is or may be carried on by means of irrigation as to the advantages for the storage of water for irrigation purposes, of the practicability of constructing reservoirs and irrigation works, together with the capacity of the streams of water and the approximate cost of construction and capacity of reservoirs and irrigation works, and such other facts as bear on the question of storage of water for irrigating purposes as required by the Act approved March 20, 1888; also for the sinking of test wells to demonstrate the existence of artesian or underground water; also to investigate the practicability of diverting rivers by means of tunnels or other works. And the Secretary of the Interior shall from time to time direct the said Director of the Geological Survey to make necessary surveys of proposed reservoirs or other irrigation works, and report upon the same, such reports to be accompanied by statements showing the location and cost of construction of such reservoirs and irrigation works and the location, quantity, and character of the land to be irrigated, together with any other facts relative to the practicability of the enterprise.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, withdraw from public entry the lands required for reservoir or other irrigation works; and any agricultural lands which it is proposed to irrigate by means of any contemplated works may also be withdrawn from entry except under the homestead act, and all such entries thereafter made and the lands embraced therein shall be subject to all the charges, terms, and conditions provided for in this act.

SEC. 4. That upon the determination by the Secretary of the Interior that any project of reclamation is practicable, he may cause to be let, upon proper public notice, contracts for the construction of necessary reservoirs or other irrigation works, in whole or in part, payments to be made from the arid-land-reclamation fund. And whenever the letting of the contract or contracts provided for in this section has been determined upon, by due notice, to be given by the Secretary of the Interior, entries of the lands irrigable from proposed reservoir or reservoirs, or other proposed irrigation works, shall thereafter be permitted only under the provisions of the homestead law and of this act, in tracts not exceeding 80 acres; and all tracts thus entered shall be subject to the payment of the charges against said lands for water rights, as hereinafter provided, and to all the provisions of this act: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Interior shall reserve from entry the necessary rights of way to and about all reservoirs or other irrigation works, the extent of all such rights of way to be determined by the said Secretary: *Provided further,* That no such contract shall be let until the necessary funds are available: *And provided further,* That in all construction work eight hours shall constitute a day's work and none but citizen labor shall be employed: *And provided further,* That contracts for construction shall include only such reservoirs and irrigation works as may be necessary to make the water provided thereby available for distribution by settlers and farmers for the reclamation of arid and semiarid lands.

SEC. 5. That the cost of any reservoir or irrigation works and of the operation and maintenance thereof for ten years after completion shall be ascertained by the Secretary of the Interior, and the amount thereof shall be divided in proportion to benefits per acre of the lands which may be irrigated thereby, and said amount, together with the further sum of \$1.25 per acre for each acre of said lands, shall be made a charge against the lands as the cost of a right to the use of water from said reservoir or irrigation works, and that all such lands shall be subject to homestead entry, after notice by the Secretary of the Interior, upon the condition that in addition to the requirements of the homestead act the entryman shall make payment to the Government of the cost per acre of the water rights as above ascertained, said payment to be made in ten annual installments, or such less number as the entryman may elect, each entryman to be limited to the entry and settlement of not to exceed 80 acres, and the moneys thus received to be covered into the arid-land-reclamation fund: *Provided,* That where the lands under any irrigation system are adapted to fruit growing, the Secretary of the Interior may further limit the maximum amount to be entered under such system by any one person: *And provided,* That no patent shall issue until the charge against the land for the cost of a water right shall have been fully

paid and discharged: And provided further, That the right to the use of the water shall be perpetually appurtenant to the land irrigated, and beneficial use shall be the basis, the measure, and the limit of the right.

SEC. 6. That in case of the failure of any person or persons to make prompt payment of any installment for the cost of a water right when due, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to direct the cutting off of the water supply to such delinquent; and if any such failure shall continue for a period of one year thereafter, the said Secretary shall declare the water right to be forfeited, and the homestead entry of such person or persons shall be canceled after due notice. In case of the cancellation of an entry as provided in this section, all moneys paid prior to such cancellation shall be forfeited to the arid-land-reclamation fund.

SEC. 7. That in case the water thus provided shall be more than sufficient for the reclamation of the irrigable public lands adjacent to any reservoirs or other irrigation works, or if land in private ownership has been found by the survey above authorized to be better suited for the utilization of the waters, or if there is a sufficiency for both, then rights to the use of such water may be sold at a price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior; but no water right shall be granted for an amount exceeding 80 acres to any one land owner, and the price in each case shall be the same in proportion to acreage and benefits, and subject to the same terms and conditions as in the case of lands similarly situated which have been entered under the homestead act, pursuant to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered to use the arid-land-reclamation fund for the operation and maintenance of all reservoirs and irrigation works provided for in this act: Provided, That when the total cost of the construction of any system of reservoirs and irrigation works, or of irrigation works, shall have been fully repaid to the Government as hereinbefore provided for, then the ownership of said irrigation works, not including reservoirs, shall pass as an appurtenance to the lands irrigated thereunder, to be maintained and operated by the owners of such lands at their own expense, under such form of organization and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior as a condition of the transfer of such ownership: And provided further, That all reservoirs constructed under this act shall be perpetually operated and maintained by the Government as public works unless otherwise provided by act of Congress.

SEC. 9. That where, in carrying out the provisions of this act, it becomes necessary for the construction, operation, or maintenance of any proposed reservoir or irrigation works to acquire any right or property, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to acquire the same for the United States by condemnation under judicial process, and to pay from the arid-land-reclamation fund the sums which may be needed for that purpose.

SEC. 10. That the United States circuit or district court of the district wherein such property is located shall have jurisdiction of proceedings for such condemnation, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney-General of the United States, upon every application of the Secretary of the Interior, under this act to cause proceedings to be commenced for condemnation within thirty days from the receipt of the application at the Department of Justice. And in all such condemnation proceedings the practice, pleadings, forms, and modes of proceedings may be governed by the provisions of this act, and shall conform, as near as may be, to the practice, pleadings, forms, and proceedings existing at the time in like cases in the courts of record of the State within which such circuit or district court is held, any rule of the court to the contrary notwithstanding: Provided, That in cases in which a tract covered by an unperfected bona fide entry or by a patent is wholly or partially included within the limits of any proposed reservoir site or the site of any proposed irrigation works the settler or owner thereof may, if he desires to do so, relinquish the tract to the Government and may select in lieu thereof a tract of vacant land open to settlement, not exceeding in area the tract covered by his entry or patent; and no charge shall be made in such cases for making the entry of record or issuing the patent to cover the tract so selected, the usual register's and receiver's fees and compensations being paid from the arid-land-reclamation fund: Provided further, That in cases of unperfected entries where the requirement of the laws respecting settlement, residence, improvement, etc., have been complied with, credit shall be allowed for the time spent on the relinquished entries: And provided further, That the election to take lieu lands as herein provided must be exercised within ninety days after notice, to be given before commencement of condemnation proceedings.

SEC. 11. That nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way interfere with the laws of any State relating to rights to water or its distribution for irrigation; and in the selection of locations for the construction of reservoirs or irrigation works under this act the Secretary of the Interior shall select localities where in his judgment the provisions of this act can be carried into effect without any conflict or interference with the laws of any State relating to irrigation; and the Secretary of the Interior may decline to let any contract for the construction of any proposed reservoir or irrigation works in any State until under the laws of such State the rights to the use of water from such reservoir or irrigation works in accordance with the provisions of this act shall be assured under the laws of such State.

SEC. 12. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry into effect the various provisions of this act.

NEWSPAPER COMMENTS ON IRRIGATION QUESTION.

The great question of the near future now looming up in national politics and legislation is irrigation. The duty of the Government in respect to the 550,000,000 acres it owns is beyond reasonable dispute. Here is an empire held in trust for the people which is worthless to them because there is no water to irrigate it and make it fertile for cultivation. Filled with enormous possibilities of wealth and empire, it repels population and is a bar to our national progress.—*Newark (N. J.) Advertiser*.

It is apparent that the river appropriations of the future are to contain allowances for improvements other than those required for navigation. The demand for the conservation of the water supplies of mountain streams by the construction of dams in suitable gorges is rational, and will receive the consideration that is due to the great question of reclaiming arid lands.—*Milwaukee Sentinel*.

The great West is just waking up to the fact that if it chooses it can force the rest of the country to consent to inaugurate a general system of arid land irrigation by means of reservoirs or else suffer the defeat of the river and harbor bill, which supplies money for nearly every State in the Union except those which lie between the Mississippi and the Pacific and have few streams within their borders. There are ten States in this section that get nothing at all in this bill, for which their representatives are asked to vote annually, and they are getting very tired of doing it and bid fair to insist on being given their share.—*Champaign (Ill.) News*.

The Committee of Congress on Arid Lands is now considering the possibilities of irrigation in some sections of the United States which are at present among its unproductive portions. If it can set before the cultivators of this country the benefits of practical methods of carrying water to dry soil it will do a great work.—*Taunton (Mass.) Gazette*.

THE WASTE PLACES.

Irrigation of the vast arid regions of the West is in some respects a matter for which the nation must assume a certain degree of responsibility, if any practical work is to be done, for the reason that the National Government alone can exercise a sufficiently far-reaching authority to control such an undertaking. To put in operation a system of irrigation works extensive enough to redeem the lands within the limits of what our early geographers described as "the Great American Desert" would require paramount rule to be put in force throughout a region extending into half a dozen States and Territories. The power of the United States, and that power alone, can effect such control.

The opponents of national irrigation plans set up the assumption that a private corporation could secure the necessary authority by charter from the several Commonwealths concerned, but that is out of the question. Theoretically it might be done, but practically it never would be done.—*Philadelphia Telegraph*.

Advocates in Congress of the reclamation of arid lands by irrigation have concluded that if the Government can spend \$80,000,000 a year on river and harbor improvements it ought to be able to help irrigation projects to a moderate extent. Hence they are making a determined effort to secure an appropriation of \$100,000 for the construction of a storage reservoir in Wyoming. Bills have also been introduced in both Houses of Congress with a view to furthering irrigation interests and laying the foundation for a general scheme of improvements. The arid region embraces parts of Arizona, Colorado, California, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, which, it is claimed, when brought under irrigation, will be capable of supporting millions of people. Private capital has already been invested in reclaiming small portions of the arid territory. Those who have studied the subject are enthusiastic over the possibilities of irrigation. Eminent Army engineers have testified that a thorough system of storage reservoirs in the arid region would diminish the size and destructive force of the annual floods in the Mississippi. Probably as our population increases and land becomes more difficult to acquire the reclamation of the arid regions of the United States will receive the attention which it deserves. The subject is one of practical interest in the West, and was regarded of sufficient political importance to be given the indorsement of both of the great national conventions last year.—*Baltimore Sun*.

The inquirer has never had any sympathy with the cheeseparers and the pullbacks who are constantly opposing great national enterprises. We believe in development and in the liberal use of money. It is necessary to dredge rivers and harbors for the benefit of commerce. We only wish that the wheat might be separated from the chaff and that there might be sufficient patriotism in Congress to cut out the mud streams and the frog ponds from the river and harbor bill and devote appropriations to the real works of necessity. Just as we believe in dredging the Delaware River to a depth that will permit the floating of the largest ocean steamship, we believe in irrigating the arid lands of the West.

There are many square miles of these lands in Washington, Wyoming, Utah, Idaho, Arizona, New Mexico, California, and the Dakotas. All that is needed to open these lands to settlement and to cultivation is water. The country around Salt Lake was once a desert, but to-day, because the water has been brought down from the mountains, it is a garden of roses. The great problem has been how to best promote irrigation, and the best solution of this problem to date is contained in the bill of Mr. HANSBROUGH of North Dakota, who has given much study to the subject. It is not necessary to go into the intricate details of this measure, which deals with public entries and payments for the use of water, but the general proposition is to reserve the money obtained from the sale of public lands as an irrigation fund to be devoted to storage reservoirs, diverting canals, and so on.

The proposition seems to be eminently fair and well considered, and certainly the scheme is worth the serious attention of Congress.—*Philadelphia Inquirer*.

IRRIGATION OF ARID WESTERN LANDS WOULD MAKE MILLIONS OF HOME-SEEKERS HAPPY.

The subject of irrigation has created an unusual amount of discussion during the present session of Congress. It has been found that there has been an organized effort to secure appropriations by the national legislature for the construction of Western irrigation works. Attempts have been made in every possible way to secure such appropriations. If defeated under one heading the effort has been vigorously renewed in some other way.

The question before the public is, What is this irrigation problem? Is it a legitimate one for the Government to consider? Is it one whose support will be a benefit to the country? Along what lines is it drawn? In short, is it a question of really national import?

Its Western advocates, regardless of political affiliations, declare that it is the most important national question to-day. Eastern legislators, regardless of party, are inclined to smile broadly at this assertion. If the internal history of the American Republic is studied carefully, however, the conclusion will be reached that national irrigation, properly wrought out, is likely to shortly come to the front as one of the most important national questions of the day. It embodies, in its truest sense, the question of home-building, and the American people have been, up to the present time, essentially a nation of home-builders. In no country in the world is the desire for home-building so strong. The wish to own and have and live upon homes has led thousands of Americans to endure trials and hardships and to brave dangers almost beyond conception. This controlling wish of the American people has conquered a continent. The hardy pioneer, with his family and his earthly belongings stowed in his wagon, looking for a home, has accomplished this. The locomotive has only followed the prairie schooner.

Now, what has this to do particularly with irrigation? Simply that the opportunity for home-building under the old order has disappeared. New cheap homes within the means of the hardy settler are, under favorable conditions, no longer available. The opening here and there to settlement of a strip of good land, such as Oklahoma, and the following rush of immigration attests to this, and also to the fact that the country is still full of home-seekers. Where, then, will they now turn?

The new homes of the future must be found on irrigated lands. There are, according to accepted Government reports, some 74,000,000 acres of rich Western land capable of irrigation if the Western waters are properly conserved. Irrigation is not an experiment in the United States, and there is no question raised as to the feasibility of this reclamation, but irrigation development in a private way has reached its limits. But since under irrigation yields are very large, a few acres of this land would generously support a family, so that with the lands irrigated rural homes would be provided for millions of citizens, waiting and anxious to go upon them.

The advocates of the national irrigation policy urge that the Government should, where possible, build storage reservoirs to catch the flood waters of the Western streams and thus provide for the reclamation of these lands. The Newlands bill, now before the House committee, and its counterpart, the Hansbrough bill, on the Senate side, provide for the setting aside of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the arid States and Territories as an "arid-land reclamation fund," to be used for building such reservoirs, and

that the cost of such construction shall be put upon the land reclaimed by them, and the land then offered for sale by the Government in small tracts to bona fide settlers upon easy terms.

Who would come to the support of such a policy?

More persons and a greater diversity of interests than supported the homestead act, and such legislation would be even more popular than the free-home enactments. What other proposition is before the country upon which labor and capital can better unite and which they can support, hand in hand, without clash or jealousy?

Every labor union in the United States which has discussed the question has unanimously supported it; every combination of capital, of whatever sort, which has considered it, has given it unqualified indorsement.

The opening of the vast area of Western lands by irrigation would provide cheap homes, certain of returning the owners a comfortable livelihood. It would create a valuable and growing market for every kind and description of manufactured product, and would thus be favored by all classes of manufacturing and commercial interests in the country. It would insure cheaper living in the West, which would result in the opening of numberless mining properties whose grade of ore is not sufficiently high to warrant development under present conditions. It would create a demand for transportation which would bring to its support every railroad interest.

Can any proposition ever before the American people claim the support of a greater diversity of interests than the irrigation and reclamation of the vast and waste areas of arid land under an honest policy which would insure their settlement in small tracts by genuine home builders?—*Philadelphia North American*.

NEW IRRIGATION PROPOSITION.

The Congressional House Committee on Irrigation has voted to report an amendment to the Newlands arid land bill, providing that the money received from arid lands be devoted to purposes of reclamation. The amount received annually by the Government from land sales is about \$4,000,000.

To divide \$4,000,000 annually among the arid-land States would give each only a mere pittance—too small to be of any practical value until it had been allowed to accumulate. If the Government would take this money and construct one or, at the most, two reservoirs, something might be accomplished. The practical working of such a reservoir would demonstrate its usefulness, and the construction of more by special appropriation would speedily follow. If it is necessary to have a reservoir as an object lesson, let this be done. The arid region asks no holdup measure. It has suggested a practical scheme whereby the Government can reclaim 75,000,000 acres or more of its own lands and render them available for farms and home building. It is entirely willing to see the scheme tested by one reservoir and to submit to the results. Its proposition is in the interest of the East as well as of the West. It is national in its scope, for it will place homes within the reach of 50,000,000 of people and create an era of permanent commercial and industrial prosperity that will benefit all sections of the Republic alike.—*Denver News*.

ARID LANDS.

Congressman NEWLANDS' bill for the reclamation of arid lands seems altogether the fairest and most sensible yet introduced at Washington. The main features of the bill provide that, with an insignificant exception, all money received from the sale of public lands in the arid and semiarid sections shall form a special fund to be expended upon the reclamation of the lands sold. The work of reclamation is to be accomplished mainly by the erection of storage reservoirs and canals. When any system of reservoirs and canals shall have been completed in any section, the cost of such system shall be charged pro rata against each acre of land therein contained, and this acre rate shall be the cost of water right to be paid for in ten annual installments by the purchasers of acreage. The money received from these water rights shall go into a fund to pay the cost of maintaining the water system in the district where these water rights have been acquired. When it is known that last year the sales of arid lands footed \$4,000,000, the value of the Newlands bill will be better appreciated.

This seems a fair and equitable solution of a vexed question, for, hitherto, the great bar to legislation in this direction, and the consequent reclamation of arid lands, has been the unwillingness of the people east of the Mississippi to pay taxes for the reclamation of lands lying west of that river, and mainly between the Rocky Mountains and the Sierra Nevada.—*Sacramento Bee*.

HOPE FOR IRRIGATION.

At last there is a movement in the direction of reclaiming the arid lands that may after a time bear fruit. In the House of Representatives a bill has been introduced by Representative NEWLANDS of Nevada, and in the Senate a similar bill has been introduced by Senator HANSBROUGH, providing that all moneys received from the sales of public lands shall be expended by the Government in aid of land reclamation and irrigation on public lands.

The fact that every dollar expended for irrigation of arid lands will make improvements in the public domain that will increase their value to more than the cost of irrigation, should be a strong argument in favor of the work, the expense of which will all be repaid by the increased value of the lands improved.—*Helena Record*.

THE NEWLANDS BILL.

Irrigation matters are prominent in Congress this winter and it looks as though liberal appropriations may be made for promoting irrigation projects in the West. The preliminary appropriation for the San Carlos reservoir in Arizona has passed the Senate, and the various other irrigation bills are being discussed. The one which is attracting most attention and which undoubtedly has great merit is that introduced by Congressman NEWLANDS, of Nevada. It provides that all money received from the sale of public lands in the arid and semiarid States be paid into a fund to be used in the construction of storage reservoirs. The fund will be known as the arid land reclamation fund. When an irrigation project instituted under this law is completed the total cost will be divided pro rata per acre of lands to be irrigated. The lands will then be subject to homestead entry, limited to 80 acres each. The bill provides that the right to the use of water shall be perpetual. In case there should be enough water for additional private lands, the right to use such may be sold under the same conditions as though going with the Government land. The provisions of this bill are very simple and obviate many of the objections urged against the national irrigation policy. It is a measure with which it would be difficult for any reasonable man to find fault. Suppose the irrigation works, such as building reservoirs, cost \$20 per acre. When the land is thrown open to entry each acre would be taxed \$20, which amount can be paid in ten annual installments. As fast as the money is paid in, it is applied to the original fund for use in the construction of additional reservoirs. In this way the money is used over and over again and much progress should be made in a small way in the reclaiming of arid lands. The sentiment in Congress seems to be favorable to irrigation projects and the friends of irrigation are very hopeful.—*Orange Judd Farmer*.

THE ARID LANDS BILL.

It is not probable that the authors of the irrigation measure to be reported to the House expect to pass it at this session. It could doubtless pass the House if it has the support of the Committee on Rules, but it could not pass the Senate in case of any serious opposition. But it has been got into shape, and has been or will be favorably reported, and the friends of irrigation will

now have a definite bill to fight for. And in the form in which it now comes it will be impossible to base opposition upon any just grounds. It simply provides that the proceeds of the public land sales in the arid and semiarid States shall be applied to the development of those States by means of irrigation under the general provisions of the Newlands bill, upon which the Chronicle has already commented. This in its original form was a wise, just bill, under which, as amended, the irrigation system will be developed at public expense from the funds arising from land sales, and the cost of the permanent work be spread over the irrigated lands and paid by the settlers who get their land for nothing, but pay the net cost of improvement. Owners of lands already taken up can obtain the water on precisely the same terms. The money to be advanced for reservoirs and ditches shall come from the sales of public lands. This is in accordance with a suggestion already made in the 'Chronicle' and destroys the excuse of the few Eastern opponents of national irrigation, while perfectly satisfying the West, as the revenue thus supplied will be all that could be profitably expended in any year. As years go on and the Treasury is recouped by payments for the improvements first made, the sums annually available will increase perhaps as rapidly as the legitimate demand for reservoirs can increase. All irrigation interests are united in the support of this measure, which promises to become a law in the near future.—*San Francisco Chronicle*.

In the Senate amendment to the river and harbor bill appropriating \$200,000 for constructing reservoirs for arid lands in Wyoming, the first Federal step has been taken in a colossal project which, if it is ever completed, will add nearly 600,000,000 acres to the productive area of the public domain in the Western States. The preliminary to this action was arranged at the last session of Congress, when an appropriation of \$100,000 was set aside to pay for surveys to ascertain in what region and to what extent the work of irrigation could be successfully undertaken by the Federal Government. Another stage was reached when the National Irrigation Congress met in Chicago, in November last, and agreed upon a vast project of operations, to conduct which Congress was memorialized to appropriate \$10,000,000 a year for a period of fifteen years. This memorial has not yet received any direct consideration in Washington, but representatives of the National Irrigation Congress have been industriously at work among both Senators and Representatives, and the \$200,000 appropriation for reservoirs in Wyoming is a sign that their efforts have not been wholly ineffective.

The scope of the undertaking which has thus received practical recognition from the Federal Government is tremendous. Its promoters contend that more than 600,000,000 acres of land now arid and useless can be reclaimed and made capable of supporting a population of 50,000,000 persons if the available water supply is properly utilized. These lands are scattered throughout the vast reaches extending from Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona to Wyoming and Montana. To fertilize these tracts and make them productive by constructing storage reservoirs and irrigation ditches would give them a value estimated as high as \$500,000,000 and attract to them an enormous and prosperous population. The lands are there, at present sterile and worthless. The water is within reach, but now largely running to waste. The question is, Can these two elements be brought together and made productive at a cost that will justify the enterprise? Men of practical experience in such work say that they can be, and if such is the fact all sensible Americans will agree that they should be.

The practicability of irrigation on an extensive scale has been conclusively demonstrated. In the West more than \$100,000,000 has already been thus invested under State and individual control, and the lands so treated have increased in value a hundredfold. The only things to consider are whether the work should be undertaken by the Federal Government on the large tracts of arid land belonging to the nation, whether these tracts should be turned over to the States within whose borders they lie on condition that they shall be watered, or whether the whole project of irrigation should be intrusted to private enterprise.

With what has been accomplished, the question of irrigation is bound to command a yearly increasing degree of public attention from this time forward. In its scope and importance it is a national question. The possibility—already conceded—of reclaiming from the desert an area of territory large enough for an empire and compelling it to yield subsistence for 50,000,000 human beings who shall thus be added to our 75,000,000 of American producers and consumers—this magnificent project is enough to stir the dullest imagination.—*New York Mail and Express*.

IRRIGATION IN CONGRESS.

If any bill is passed by the present Congress in aid of storage irrigation reservoirs—which now looks extremely doubtful—it will be the Hansbrough-Newlands bill. They are similar bills, one introduced in the Senate and the other in the House. In the Senate the measure is pressed by Senator HANSBROUGH, and favorable report has been made by the Public Lands Committee, backed by approval of the Interior Department.

This bill, writes Executive Chairman George H. Maxwell, of the National Irrigation Association, should have the united support of the West. The passage at this session would give a tremendous impetus to Western development. It removes much of the old opposition from the East to make direct appropriations for storage reservoirs and arid land reclamation in the West, because it only sets aside the proceeds from the sale of public lands as a fund to be used by the National Government for this purpose. "This will provide a fund of several millions a year," says Mr. Maxwell. "In my judgment," he continues, "there is no doubt that a few object lessons in actual construction, showing the great resulting benefits, would so much further remove Eastern opposition that it would be but a step to secure direct appropriations enlarging this fund to any desired amount in reason, and to bring about the full inauguration of the policy of national water storage as advocated in the Chittenden report. The way to get what we want in the West is to get it by gradual stages."

If this bill can be passed at this session, of which a week only remains, it will be welcomed by the West. If it fails for want of time, it can be reintroduced and pressed with more certainty of success at the next session. In the meantime the spring session of the National Irrigation Association at Colorado Springs should be utilized by all friends of this movement to get a definite understanding among all the Congressional delegations of the arid land States as to just what they want, and just what they will put into a bill. There has been considerable pulling at cross purposes by Western members, not from hostile intent, but from a difference of opinion as to details. A conference on the bill and a definite understanding will result in a stronger movement than ever. If this Hansbrough-Newlands bill can be obtained, or a similar one, a fund will soon be provided by which the utility of storage reservoirs can be practically demonstrated. When such demonstration shall have been made the task of obtaining direct appropriations for more reservoirs will have been rendered an easy one, and the reclamation of 75,000,000 acres of arid public land will go rapidly on.—*Denver News*.

AN IRRIGATION PLAN.

The agitation in favor of Government irrigation of the arid lands of the country has resulted in the introduction of a dozen bills in Congress, most of which are merely tentative, being designed to begin the work experimentally. These measures are generally opposed by Eastern people, but the bill which

Representative NEWLANDS, of Nevada, has offered is designed to disarm opposition.

The Newlands bill provides, in brief, for raising a special reclamation fund from the proceeds of sales of Government arid lands. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to procure plans for reservoirs and to withdraw from entry the lands which it is proposed to irrigate from them, and to enter into contracts for the construction of such reservoirs, the cost to be payable out of the arid land reclamation fund. Upon the completion of each irrigation project the total cost of it is to be ascertained and divided pro rata per acre of the lands to be irrigated, and such amount shall be a charge against the lands as the cost of the water right. It is further provided that the lands are to be subject to homestead entry, each entry to be limited to 80 acres, and the water right is to be paid for in annual payments extending over ten years. All waters received from the sale of water rights are to go into the reclamation fund.

The San Francisco Call thinks that this bill may not encounter hostility from the East. "An important feature of the measure," says that paper, "is that it meets the objection made by Eastern Congressmen that the reclamation of the arid lands by the Government would be in effect to tax the East for the benefit of the West. The objection is not valid, for the lands after redemption would be available for Eastern homeseekers as well as for Western men, and the upbuilding of that great region would benefit all sections of the Union. Nevertheless, since the objection is made it is just as well to meet it. By the Newlands scheme the fund for the redemption of the arid lands is to be obtained from the sale of Western lands. Perhaps that will lead Eastern men to look upon the great enterprise with more favor, and if that be so, a beginning of the work may be made much sooner than is now expected."—*San Diego Union*.

NATIONAL IRRIGATION.

Congress has at length taken up the subject of the reclamation of the arid portion of our national domain, and while no legislation is to be expected at this session, except the usual appropriations for surveys and investigations, the tone of the discussion indicates that public sentiment is ripe for beginning construction. A small portion of the Eastern farming community seem to fear that the opening of these new lands will impair the value of Eastern farms, but as the Secretary of the Interior lately pointed out in an official communication to a Congressional committee, "the creation of these homes * * * will in no way reduce the value of the lands now cultivated. The crops produced in the arid regions are entirely distinct in their nature from those of the humid East and seek other markets." The Secretary might have added that under no probable limit of national expenditure will land be made ready for homes as fast as the increase of population provides new people to occupy them.

There are a few who object to the expenditure as a "bad precedent." It is far too late to raise such an issue. The principle of improving the national domain at the national expense was established when the first jetty was built to protect a harbor or the first snag taken from a navigable stream. More than that, from the foundation of the Government the United States has been selling the national domain and putting the money into the general Treasury, from which some part has gone to improve the harbors of Atlantic cities and the rivers of States which never had any distinct ownership in the lands from whose sale they derived benefit. Now that the time has come, shall no part of the money derived from the sale of these lands be employed for the benefit of the States in which they are situated? The people of the United States have received hundreds of millions of dollars from the sale of public lands. Even now, after having given away and while continuing to give away enormous quantities of land, the sales continue.

During the last fiscal year the cash sales of land by the United States amounted to \$2,899,731, of which \$2,286,191 comes from States wholly or in part arid. These sales have continued for years, and will continue for years longer; and shall not those arid States, by the sale of whose lands the National Treasury is replenished, receive some benefit from that Treasury? Shall they not at least receive the poor boon of an advance to reclaim the dry lands to be repaid by the settlers as they take it? The nation has no moral right to give away all the land in these States which is readily susceptible of tillage and leave the State areas of public land which pay no taxes and which the Government refuses to make habitable by national improvement. The public has recognized the justice of these claims. The sons of the objecting farmers of the East are eager to get homes upon these lands, and the manufacturers are anxious that they should afford a market for their products. When these States get all that they ask they will not begin to get back what they have directly contributed to the Treasury of the nation from the single source of the lands within their boundaries.—*San Francisco Chronicle*.

ARID LAND RECLAMATION.

The discussion of irrigation matters in Senate and House has developed many ideas on both sides of the controversy as to whether the arid lands should be improved at Government expense. Some of the Western members have clearly been animated purely by local considerations. Some of the Eastern members, in their desire to prevent the expenditure of public money in the West, have been led into an exposure of their ignorance of the matter under discussion which should be a warning to aspiring statesmen to confine their efforts to more familiar fields. The entire question at issue, so far as Congress is concerned, is the principle involved, and not the manner in which it may be carried out. The latter can safely be left in the hands of experts who are prepared to give the Government the benefit of their full experience.

The time will come when the millions of acres of fertile land now uninhabitable for lack of water will be needed for homes and as an outlet for a rapidly increasing population. With the pressure which is always behind a measure conferring local benefits, it will be decided long before the real necessity arises that the people need more room, and as a general principle it can safely be left to the influences of such pressure to accomplish all that is necessary in extending the habitable area. It is equally certain, however, that in time money will be spent by the Government for the reclamation of arid lands, and in view of this there is one step Congress should take which admits of no delay. The possibilities of water conservation should be fully determined, and all Government land which will come under the influence of works to be constructed later on should be reserved from settlement or entry. In view of the present wide divergence of opinion as to the propriety of spending money for the actual reclamation of this land, a compromise should easily be reached providing for the advance knowledge necessary and for the protection of Government interests later on.—*New York Commercial Advertiser*.

EXPANSION.

The reflex action from the Territorial expansion craze that took possession of the people at the close of the Spanish war is being manifested in a universal determination to press upon Congress the advisability of reclaiming our arid domain. There appears no good reason for the acquisition of transoceanic territory when an area equal to that now under cultivation in the United States awaits only the proper distribution of its annual moisture to make it the most productive section of North America.

Since the Chicago meeting of the National Irrigation Association the metropolitan press from Maine to San Francisco has been unanimous in urging

upon Congress the necessity for national control of the water sources in the regions where irrigation is possible. That a large per cent of the 75,000,000 acres of sterile land can be made productive by a system of storage reservoirs all now admit; that the work of building these reservoirs and the main canals is the duty of the General Government no one denies.

This irrigation proposition applies not only to the arid regions adjacent to mountain ranges but to reaches of semiarid plains like the western half of Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas. Here the construction work to retain the surplus rainfall is less costly and comparatively simple. Besides raising the waters of the rivers to a higher level by means of dams, a system of earthworks in the coulees will store the surface drainage for use in dry seasons, and afford increased surface for evaporation, thus tending to increase the local rainfall.

It is a well known fact that the drainage of swamps and the practice of tiling the lowlands in our Mississippi Valley States have so reduced the amount of local moisture that dry spells are becoming much more numerous. In large sections of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota where crops were never known to fail twenty years ago, the uncertainty of crops, owing to drought, is causing much inconvenience and anxiety. The farmers of these fertile regions will soon be compelled to devise means to store the water, that in times past they were so anxious to be rid of. They are face to face with the question of partial irrigation.

Nor is the fear of drought the only cause of anxiety flowing from the wasteful disposition of moisture. The fear of floods is now becoming a constant quantity to the owners of all bottom lands along the rivers. The citizens of Portage, Wis., have just petitioned the State legislature for aid to defend themselves against the annual floods of the Wisconsin River. The floods of the Ohio River have become historical; so have the floods of the rivers of Texas. The question of protection against floods and that of a national system of irrigation are inseparable. The floods of the Lower Mississippi are becoming a national menace. The root of the evil must be sought—the floods must be retained at the head waters of the great river and its tributaries and turned to some useful end instead of running reckless to the sea.

This irrigation agitation promises to be of as much benefit to the old, settled, and semihumid districts as to the arid section. It is educating the public, giving to the people facts the possession of which will make concert of action possible.

In reclaiming the semidesert wastes of our Western States every citizen of the country is interested. Every city from the coast to the heart of the continent will be directly benefited by the increased population of our interior domain. The region that it is proposed to redeem will support a population of 100,000,000.

Every business interest from the selling of apples to the railroads should urge upon Congress immediate and favorable action on this question of interior expansion.—*St. Paul Globe*.

RECLAIMING ARID LANDS.

Although but a little over two weeks remain of the present session of Congress, it is gratifying to note that the Newlands bill, providing for a comprehensive scheme of arid-land reclamation, was yesterday reported by the committee of the House having it in charge at Washington. It is quite a feat to have such a bill reported.

It is not likely that anything will be done to make the bill a law, as it is a matter which has the suggestion of an appropriation about it. The latter subject is now the most painful one which afflicts the mind of the legislator. The period has approached when there is opportunity to make a tentative footing of the long columns of figures which stand for Government expenditures. The result is rather appalling and is making some Congressmen afraid to go home. Those who got what their constituents wanted in the way of pie will have to face that phrase of reprobation, "billion-dollar Congress," while those who failed to secure any legislative loot will be blamed for extravagance as well as their own ill success and "easiness" in letting the other fellows get away with it.

The attention of Congress henceforth to the end of the session will be occupied mainly with paring down the billion creation to make it look like the million structures with which we are familiar. The Newlands bill for reclaiming desert lands will therefore have no show, although it is one of those measures which belong in the investment class, promising dividends, as distinguished from those which provide for the national bread and butter, and the still larger class of luxuries and superfluities.

Among the provisions of the Newlands bill is one that provides that the receipts from the sales of lands in the so-called arid States shall be devoted to reclaiming remaining lands which are still arid and subject to reclamation. This seems like a fair proposition and it has a suggestion of an endless chain about it—one acre when sold will have the power to make a fraction of another acre habitable and salable. The sales of land in the arid States during the past year have amounted to about \$4,000,000, and this amount, if wisely expended, might put many acres of the "desert" on the market at gilt-edge prices.

But it seems that the Government needs this money for other purposes this year, such as armies, navies, ship subsidies, etc. It is too poor this year to think of making land for more homes. Instead of adding a few acres to the old farm there is a disposition to buy a new piano and some furniture for the home.

There were other grounds for opposition to the bill in the House besides the alarming prospect that the money of the Government will run short. There were intimations that the project is not constitutional. This is not at all surprising. The venerable instrument which is supposed to guard our liberties is responsible for many queer happenings. It is now engaged in an unbecoming struggle with our glorious flag over the mere question of precedence in some islands which we recently acquired. It has knocked out our income tax proposition, and at the same time has trampled in the dust the ambitions of the very citizens who applauded it for that act. With such a record for "knocking" there need be little surprise to find it squelching the Newlands bill. Anything so transparently simple and sensible is quite likely to be unconstitutional.—*Los Angeles Express*.

TO RECLAIM ARID LANDS.

Omaha's Commercial Club has taken an advanced position on the matter of irrigation, being among the foremost in advocating the proposition that the General Government assist in the work of reclaiming the arid regions. Fully a year ago the Commercial Club announced its position on this matter and has since consistently worked along the lines then laid down. Its present effort to secure the adoption of a memorial to Congress by the legislature is but another step in the direction of the general move.

There is no questioning the logic of the Commercial Club's position. The general work of reclaiming the arid lands of the West has proceeded to almost the limit of private resource or State interest. This is not because the ventures in the way of irrigation have been found unprofitable, for wherever land has been put under ditch and a water supply has been found available the return in crops has been amply remunerative. But certain questions have arisen concerning the use of interstate waters which can not be determined by State legislation, and these must be taken cognizance of by the General Government. The conservation of the water supply is the real key to the situation. Nearly all of the unreclaimed arid region is still public

domain, owned by the people of the United States. As such the interest of the people lies directly in the course of action proposed by the Commercial Club.

Efforts at securing the reclamation of this arid land through legislation designed to encourage and stimulate State and individual action, such as the Carey desert land law, have been only partly successful. Much land has been taken up under that act and similar legislation, but its development has been hampered for lack of means sufficient to control the conditions surrounding the water supply. Experts who have studied the question deeply are agreed that the desert can only be redeemed through a general and comprehensive plan for the control of the water. As to details there is some dispute, which can only be determined after a thorough investigation.

One thing is certain. Only the General Government can provide the means and exercise the authority needed for the successful establishment and maintenance of the general system that will be necessary for the conservation of the water needed to carry on the irrigation of the vast area now lying idle. It is to secure this Government action that the Commercial Club is now working. Its efforts should have the hearty support not only of the legislature, but of all who have the real welfare of the West at heart.—*Omaha Bee*.

PLAN BIG MOVEMENT—NATIONAL BUSINESS LEAGUE WOULD RECLAIM ARID LANDS.

What promises to be one of the greatest undertakings in the history of the country practically found its inception yesterday at a meeting of the executive committee of the National Business League, when resolutions were drawn up and adopted calling upon Congress for an annual appropriation of \$250,000 for surveys of irrigation works for the reclamation and settlement of arid lands in the West. While it remained for the National Business League to take the first active steps in the matter, that body was not the first to propose such a scheme. That the business interests of the West demand that the millions of acres of the public land in the West be developed and that part of the country be allowed thereby to progress in proportion to the East is admitted generally throughout the country.

Through George H. Maxwell, executive chairman of the National Irrigation Association, was the plan brought before the National Business League, and the former body based its action mainly upon a report of the Secretary of the Interior, which stated that 74,000,000 acres in the western half of the United States, capable of supporting 50,000,000 persons, can be reclaimed by irrigation.

Already favorable action on the matter has been taken by a number of local and national organizations, and resolutions indorsing the movement have been adopted by the Commercial Club of St. Paul, Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Commercial Club of Omaha, the Missouri River Hardware Jobbers' Association, National Irrigation Congress, Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress, St. Louis Manufacturers' Association, Los Angeles Board of Trade, National Association of Merchants and Travelers, Chicago, the Missouri Press Association, and other organizations and individuals.—*Chicago Evening Post*.

THE ARID LANDS OF THE WEST.

[By Charles W. Maier, third vice-grand master of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen.]

It has been said by those who claimed to be in possession of facts and figures that west of the Mississippi River there is land enough to insure living for 100,000,000 of people; as it is now, there are scarcely more than 10,000,000 of people in that part of the United States that farm for a livelihood. One of the greatest drawbacks to the farmer in the West is the lack of precipitation at the time when it is most needed to mature the growing crops. To solve this question and solve it right will require brains and plenty of money as well.

A few years ago the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad experimented in western Kansas in trying to make it rain, but their efforts proved a failure. To agitate the atmosphere and bring rain was out of the question. From that day until the present time little, if anything, has ever been heard of the "rainmaker." That millions of acres of land west of the great river would produce vegetation if there were plenty of rainfall, that now is barren, is not doubted by those who are acquainted with the present existing conditions.

In western Kansas there is plenty of rain during the months of April, May, and June, but as farmers try to raise corn more moisture is needed in July and August than at any other time for this kind of a growing crop. In many other Western States water is needed to insure crops of whatever kind is put in the ground. Orchards and vineyards will not thrive in a dry climate. Water is needed to make trees and vines grow as well as to bear and produce good fruit.

To visit California and see the fine orchards and vineyards laden down with good fruits nearly every year is to appreciate the fact that if it were not for the water that is brought to the farm by irrigating ditches and is taken over the land to nourish the trees and vines there would be little, if any, fruit raised in that great State.

To see the orange groves at Riverside, Cal., laden down with oranges, many of the trees with their limbs propped up to keep them from breaking, is a sight worth seeing. This land is worth as much as a thousand dollars per acre, and if it were not for water brought to the orange orchards by irrigating ditches this same land would not be worth paying taxes upon; but as it is, it is valuable and a regular paradise to look upon, and I have often wondered if there was anything more needed in that part of the country to make man's happiness complete. Many acres of alfalfa hay grow in California where there is plenty of water, and the same thing can be said of many other Western States at the present day. Notwithstanding the many acres of land under cultivation in the West, made so by irrigation, there is still many times more good land that would produce just as well if there were plenty of water to irrigate the land.

'Tis true, in the spring of the year there is plenty of moisture for all purposes, but as warm weather approaches the snow in the mountains disappears, and as there is no place to store the water it soon finds itself in the sea; and when summer is on in dead earnest the snow is all melted away; the streams quit running; trees and vegetation suffer on account of lack of moisture.

There is now a bill before Congress asking for an appropriation of \$9,000,000 to build storage reservoirs to hold the flood waters that would otherwise run away.

This is a project only a government can or should undertake in order that such an undertaking may be made a success.

That a private individual or corporation should undertake to get control of such an enterprise after Congress appropriates this money should not be allowed under any circumstances.

The Government should own and control all storage reservoirs and waterways leading to all ditches that carry water to the consumer.

Again, no one individual should be allowed to own one acre more land than he could himself use.

To allow land speculators to get control of valuable land would be a curse to the country. There are many persons to-day who would be only too glad to get out upon farms and make a living if they were only sure of raising crops

The lack of moisture is the only drawback, as a rule, that prevents the farmer from making a good crop each year.

Crop failures are almost unknown in countries where they are watered by artificial process.

The crowded conditions of our cities demand that something be done for the people who are compelled to work for a living. Once out of employment it now seems a hard matter to get a position anywhere or at any kind of work. Railroad men find it a hard matter to get employment, even if there is work to be had. The first questions that are asked of a railroad man on about every road are, "How old are you?" "What is your weight?" "What road have you last worked for?" "Are your references all right?" etc. Now, if it happens to be a locomotive fireman that is being asked these questions, and if he should happen to be 30 years of age, weight less than 160 pounds, and also lack a fair education, and can not get a reference from a railroad official whom he last worked for, he is told there is no employment for him, notwithstanding the fact that he can handle the pick and scoop successfully. Any one of these questions asked and failed to be answered will keep the fireman from going to work, and what is true in case of the fireman is true of all train men. It does not seem that experience cuts much figure, as an inexperienced man could be standing by and he could get employment as fireman, though he never threw a shovel of coal into an engine in his life. All the requirement that he would need to have would be that he was not over 26 years of age.

Therefore, when railroad men lose their usual employment, it would be a nice thing if they could go out on a little piece of land, and make a living and be independent. But on account of the failure of crops year after year, there are not many who care to undertake the task of trying to make a living by farming.

It will always be impossible to store enough water to supply the wants of all the tillers of the soil, and even if there were plenty of water, some portions of our valleys could not be irrigated on account of the rolling condition of the country.

One other thing can be done to assist nature in bringing rain, and that is to prevent the destruction of our forests, and call upon all people to plant trees wherever it is possible to do so, and there will be little, if any, trouble in getting plenty of rainfall.

The writer well remembers when the "rain belt" in Kansas only extended about 75 miles west of the Missouri State line. Now it is twice that distance. This change has been undoubtedly brought about by the farmers tilling the soil and planting forests; and if this good work is kept up, the time will come when hot winds and droughts will be almost unknown in Kansas and Nebraska.

That something must be done in these United States to help the laboring classes is a fact worth considering, and nothing better can be accomplished than for our Government to go ahead and appropriate money and carry out the storing of water and encourage the planting of forests, in order that those who wish to till the soil can do so, and at the same time be assured a living after they work hard for the same. Workmen can not get along very well when they are idle half of the time; and such is the fact, as can be proven, for when business falls off, workmen are laid off until such times as business increases again. This works a hardship to the man who is trying hard to take care of his family.

One thing more before we conclude, and that is this: Whatever Congress does in the way of appropriating money to store the flood waters of the country for irrigating purposes, the project must be owned by the people and for the good of the people; or, in other words, owned and controlled by the Government, and private individuals and corporations should keep hands off.

If the people do not own the new enterprise for themselves, look out for what will surely follow. There will be a water meter on every irrigating ditch, and the water rate will be so high that few will be able to buy it.

Let that which is given to us by Him who rules the universe be free, and to be used by the people for their own good and to their own advantage.—*Locomotive Firemen's Magazine*.

THE NATIONAL IRRIGATION MOVEMENT.

The national irrigation movement has now advanced to a stage where it is no longer a question as to whether the Federal Government shall undertake the irrigation of the arid lands which it owns, but as to the ways and means by which this desirable object may most satisfactorily be attained.

The new president of the National Irrigation Association, Thomas F. Walsh, has issued a circular letter in which he states that he has consented to act as president of the association because he is profoundly impressed with the far-reaching importance of its objects. In this letter Mr. Walsh says:

"The problem is broadly national in its scope and can be solved in no other way than by the adoption of the national policy advocated by our association. The public domain is the property of the whole people and must be administered as a trust for their benefit, and not another acre of it should ever be ceded to any State or Territory for any purpose or granted away to anyone but an actual bona fide settler or home-builder on the land, and then only in small farms. The great reservoirs and irrigation works necessary to bring the water within reach of settlers must be built by the National Government.

"The reclamation and settlement of this great arid region would benefit every section of our country and every class of our citizens. Every new farm or home in the West would create a new customer for our merchants and manufacturers in the East, and when we can multiply these new homes by millions, the magnitude of the problem brings it home to every business man in the country, as a matter of immediate individual interest and importance."

These sentences have the right ring. Mr. Walsh goes on to speak of the evil results from the tendency of our population to concentrate in great cities, and insists that, as Secretary of Agriculture Wilson has aptly said, the rural homes of the country are the "safeguards of the nation." It has been mainly the isolation of country life which has driven so many from the country to the city, and irrigation will do more than anything else to remove this isolation, because with it necessarily comes intensive culture, small farms, trees, plants, beautiful farm homes, good roads, free rural mail delivery, near-by neighbors, schools, churches, and an attractive social environment. As Mr. Walsh says, whoever has seen the irrigated colonies of California or Colorado will appreciate this better than it can be described. It was, he says, this broad humanitarian phase of the movement that first attracted him to it.

To carry out the plans of the association, national legislation will be necessary, and all members are urged to promptly and earnestly respond to every request made of them for their cooperation to further any legislation that the association may indorse, because it is promised that none will be indorsed unless it shall have had the most careful consideration, and shall be sound, wise, just, and conservative.

The Times recently published a number of extracts from articles on national irrigation, which have appeared of late in leading daily papers of the country, more than 100 of which have so far strongly indorsed the movement. In the course of a recent editorial on this subject the St. Paul Globe says:

"Without doubt this problem of irrigation with its corollaries is the most important and far-reaching proposition ever brought before Congress. Beside it the Isthmian Canal project seems insignificant."

"One hundred million should be appropriated at once to be expended on the continuing-contract system. The work will of necessity cover many years. There would be no opposition to this enterprise. While the nation is spending millions to subdue the Tagals, a moiety might be ventured to subdue the rebellious acres in the heart of our country."

Undoubtedly the first work in this line which the Government should undertake is the construction of a dam on the Gila River at San Carlos, in Arizona, because this improvement would not only bring under cultivation a large area of arid land for the use of white settlers, but would also relieve the urgent needs of thousands of friendly Indians, who are now in a starving condition because the water upon which they have been dependent for centuries has been diverted by white settlers above them. This improvement would be not only a striking object-lesson of the advantage of irrigation on a large scale, but also an act of mercy and justice.—*Los Angeles Times*.

IRRIGATION ON THE NILE.

British brains and enterprise is about to convert the valley of the Nile into a veritable Garden of Eden. What Joseph attempted when he was virtual ruler of Egypt will be accomplished by the present Egyptian Government with the counsel and assistance of British engineers and capital.

A dam across the Nile near its mouth has for some time made the delta an agricultural paradise. The success of this first attempt to hold the surplus water for the time of need was so great that a second dam was projected at Assouan, 700 miles up the valley. This enterprise has just been completed. It is a stupendous structure of granite—a triumph of engineering skill—and will retain the waters of the Nile sufficient to irrigate the valley for 150 miles back and down to the dam above the delta. Another dam, 300 miles farther up the Nile, is under way which, when constructed, will complete a system of irrigation 1,000 miles long and from 100 to 300 miles broad.

Here is an object lesson for the United States on the question of redeeming our desert empire of the West. With these immense reservoirs the tilters of the valley of the Nile will not be subject to the capricious fluctuations of that historic stream, but can sow with the absolute certainty of reaping in time of harvest. The predictions of the engineers who constructed the lower dam on the Nile near Cairo have been verified so completely that entire confidence is felt in the promises made on behalf of the reservoir at Assouan.

It would pay the Government or the National Irrigation Association to dispatch a committee of experts to examine and report on this British-Egyptian system of irrigation.

The American public is interested in this Nile enterprise for other than agricultural and scientific reasons.

Great Britain is in Egypt for a purpose. The scheme to reclaim the great valley of the Nile from the desert sands has a deeper meaning than a desire to develop Egypt. The raw materials required by British textile factories must come from some other and nearer source than America and India. This is imperative.

The competition of the United States will otherwise drive the British products out of the world's markets. As Napoleon saw in Egypt a field of conquest and a basis from which he could strike England in the East, so England sees in Egypt a field for a commercial conquest—a means by which she can oppose the ruinous advance of American competition.

With the vast valley of the Nile subject to the dominion of man, England will have at her back door a cotton-producing section as great as our Southern States; not so great in geographical extent, but fully as great in producing power.

"The new is old and the old is ever new." The enterprise of the twentieth century returns to the cradle of the world to drive back the desert lands and to people it again with millions of busy toilers. The engineering skill that reared the pyramids left an enduring monument, but the skill that erected the Assouan dam will do more, it will cause the Sphinx to speak after its centuries of silence and in the smiling valley will reveal to us what Egypt was when the Pharaohs ruled.—*St. Paul Globe*.

THE LESSON OF LOST CITIES.

The account which we published on Sunday last of the intensely interesting archaeological discoveries in Syria piques curiosity to ask some pertinent and important questions. There were found, largely in an admirable state of preservation, the remains of nearly two score splendid and extensive cities. In what way have they been so marvelously well kept while other abandoned cities of later date have crumbled into almost unrecognizable ruin? And how was it possible for a population of many millions to be sustained in prosperity and luxury in a region which is now so inhospitable a desert that, to use Sheridan's grim words, a bird flying over it must carry his rations with him? We know that once it was a fertile land. The richness of the pastures and flocks and herds of Bashan has for ages been proverbial, and to this day the orchards of Damascus and the wheat fields of the Hauran are the admiration of the world. Why is this land of the 33 cities a glaring desert of sand and basalt?

We may answer our first question with the last. The remains of the cities have been preserved partly because they were well built and partly because ever since their abandonment the land has been an arid desert. There is no vegetation and there is no humidity. There is a fair amount of rain from October to May—the annual precipitation at Jerusalem is about the same as at Chicago—and from May to October there are nightly dews. But, falling upon beds of sand or slopes of limestone and basalt, all such moisture swiftly vanishes leaving no trace behind. In so dry an air the deserted buildings may well be imperishable. But what change has thus "dried up realms to deserts?" The answer is not difficult to find. It is to be read in the traces of vast irrigation systems, now for centuries neglected, and in the well-maintained systems which keep Damascus and the Hauran fertile to this day.

Whether or not the country was ever well wooded may now be an unanswerable question, though it is at least reasonable to suppose that at one time it was profusely clothed with vegetation, arboreal and herbal, which was destroyed by the recklessness and prodigality of man, as it is to-day being destroyed in our own land. Certain it is that when these "lost cities" were in their prime the fertility of the land was maintained by systematic irrigation, which not only supplied needed moisture to the soil, but also, by fostering vegetation, aided in conserving and regulating the natural moisture that fell from the clouds. As long as the people were there and kept up irrigation works the land was fertile. As soon as the people were removed—whether by slaughter of war, by pestilence, or by any other means, we know not—the work of artificial irrigation ceased and the land became a desert. Rain continued to fall copiously for half the year, but it fell upon a soil void of vegetation. The result was that its precipitate torrents washed the soil away, leaving the hillsides mere slopes of rocks.

That is the explanation of the conditions which to-day prevail in that land of lost cities. We shall be blind indeed if we do not perceive in it a lesson apt and valuable to our own land. Exactly what has occurred in Syria might occur in the United States. Nay, in incipient degree it is to-day occurring, and that within a few hours' ride of the city of New York. There are regions in this State where forests have been ruthlessly swept away and the land left bare. The result is that hillsides once covered with vegetation and with deep, rich soil are now glaring slopes of naked rock; streams which once flowed steadily the whole year round are now raging and destructive torrents for a

time and the rest of the year entirely dry, and farm lands which once were perennially fertile now ruinously alternate between flood and drought. We know that the dreadful famines of India and China are largely due to the reckless deforestation of the mountain slopes and consequent derangement, not only of the brook and river systems, but of the climate itself. We know that Spain and France and Italy and Turkey have all suffered and are to-day suffering sorely from the same cause. Rentzsch went even so far as to declare in all seriousness that the political decadence of Spain was "wholly due to the destruction of her forests." We may not accede to quite so extreme a view. But the lesson of all the Mediterranean lands, from Spain to Syria, is unmistakable. Wherever forests exist, conserve them; wherever the land is arid, irrigate it. And it is a lesson which not even the most fertile garden spot of this fertile land can afford to ignore.—*New York Tribune*.

THE COMMERCIAL CLUB OF OMAHA.

Omaha, Neb., February 8, 1901.

MY DEAR SIR: I inclose copy of resolutions passed by this club relative to the General Government appropriating funds to make surveys and build dams and main canals throughout the great West.

We hope you will give the subject careful attention and use your efforts to promote this worthy cause.

The further development of the West is alike valuable to all sections of the country, because the West buys all the different products produced in all sections. It will build up the revenues of the Government by turning the deserts in the West into farms and ranches, thus producing boundless wealth; it will make homes for the millions that annually compose our expanding population; it is the greatest and most economical question before Congress to-day; it is a progressive idea and will in time prevail, because it is a clean-cut business proposition and full of merit.

It may be you will consider it your duty from a standpoint of justice to the West to favor this great plan of development. It is the only appropriation of any magnitude being asked for by the West. Our demands are reasonable and appeal to your best judgment.

Again urging you to aid in carrying out this grand undertaking, and assuring you of our hearty appreciation, we are,

Respectfully, yours,

COMMERCIAL CLUB OF OMAHA,
J. E. UTT, Secretary.

Hon. F. G. NEWLANDS,
Washington, D. C.

Resolutions of the Omaha Commercial Club in relation to the reclamation and settlement of arid America, unanimously adopted October 2, 1900.

Whereas the public domain, which is the heritage of the whole people of this country and now belongs to them, comprises more than one-third of the entire area of the United States, and is situated almost wholly in its western half; and as the Secretary of the Interior, speaking of the irrigable and public lands, said in his annual report for 1899—

"That this vast acreage, capable of sustaining and comfortably supporting under a proper system of irrigation a population of at least 50,000,000 people, should remain practically a desert is not in harmony with the progressive spirit of the age or in keeping with the possibilities of the future;" and

Whereas, in the words of the Secretary of Agriculture in his last annual report—

"More than one-third of the country depends upon the success of irrigation to maintain the people, the industries, and the political institutions of that area, and future growth will also be measured by the increase of the reclaimed area. In a region which in the extent and diversity of its mineral wealth has no equal on the globe, the riches of the mines in the hills are already surpassed by the productions of the irrigated farms in the valleys, and the nation at large is at last awakening to the fact that the development of the use of the rivers and arid lands of the West will constitute one of the most important epochs in our increase in population and mineral wealth;" and

Whereas as stated in the report of Capt. Hiram M. Chittenden, Engineer Corps, U. S. A., on Surveys for Reservoir Sites:

"First, a comprehensive reservoir system in the arid regions of the United States is absolutely essential to the future welfare of this portion of the national domain;

"Second, it is not possible to secure the best development of such a system except through the agency of the Federal Government;" and

Whereas it is estimated that there are 100,000,000 acres of the public lands which can be reclaimed by irrigation, and it has been demonstrated by twenty years of experience in irrigation development and established by the reports of irrigation experts and engineers of the Federal Government that the reclamation of this great arid region of the United States involves many interstate problems and requires the construction of irrigation works on a scale so large as to be beyond the scope of private enterprise or the financial resources of the States, and the Federal Government could reimburse itself for all its outlays from sales of the lands reclaimed; and

Whereas the benefits which would flow from the transformation of this vast and now uninhabitable desert waste into fertile fields and happy homes and prosperous communities would be national in their scope, benefiting every section of the country and every class of the people, adding enormously to our national wealth and prosperity, stimulating mining, manufacturing, industry, and commerce in every channel and locality, opening up opportunities for millions of home builders, creating new home markets in the West for the products of the Eastern factories, benefiting alike the merchants, the manufacturers, the workers in the Eastern factories, and the Eastern farmers who feed them; and

Whereas this great problem can only be solved and the inestimable benefits which would result from the reclamation of this vast territory can only be secured to the people of this nation by the inauguration of a broad national policy and a fixed and unalterable adherence to the fundamental principles which should control that policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the adoption of the following complete and comprehensive national policy for the preservation, reclamation, and settlement of the public domain:

1. All the remaining public lands to be held and administered as a trust for the benefit of the whole people of the United States, and no grants of the title to any of the public lands to be hereafter made to any State or Territory or to anyone but actual settlers and home builders on the land.

2. The preservation and development of our national resources by the construction of storage reservoirs by the Federal Government for flood protection, and to save for use in aid of navigation and irrigation the flood waters which now run to waste and cause overflow and destruction.

3. The construction by the Federal Government of storage reservoirs and irrigation works wherever necessary to furnish water for the reclamation and settlement of the arid public lands.

4. The preservation of the forests and reforestation of denuded forest areas as sources of water supply, the conservation of existing supplies by approved methods of irrigation and distribution, and the increase of the water resources of the arid region by the investigation and development of underground supplies, and the united ownership of land and water.

And resolved further, That we respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States that an appropriation of not less than \$250,000 should be made annually for irrigation surveys and maps of irrigable public lands, with plans and estimates of cost of reservoirs, canals, and irrigation works necessary for their reclamation and for sinking experimental artesian wells, and \$100,000 for the irrigation investigations of the Department of Agriculture.

And resolved further, That we likewise urge upon Congress that the national policy above set forth should be fully installed without delay and that liberal appropriations should be immediately made for the construction of storage reservoirs and irrigation works and for forest preservation and reforestation in accordance with said policy, and that such appropriation should be commensurate in amount with the great national interests involved and the magnitude of the results to be accomplished.

And resolved further, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each Senator and Congressman from this State, and also to every other Senator and Representative in Congress, and that they be respectfully requested to use every proper means and influence to secure said appropriations, and to oppose the enactment by Congress of any laws relating to the public lands not in harmony with the policy above set forth.

And resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be sent to every commercial organization in the United States with a request for their indorsement of the national policy set forth in the foregoing resolutions, and for their active cooperation to secure its adoption and inauguration; and also asking for their aid to enlist the interest and support of their Senators and Congressmen in favor of the said appropriations.

And whereas the National Business League on September 26, 1900, adopted resolutions embodying the policy advocated by this club in the foregoing resolutions, and has requested the indorsement of their resolutions by other organizations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Omaha Commercial Club does hereby indorse the resolutions of said National Business League with reference to the reclamation and settlement of arid America, and will cooperate with the National Business League to secure the inauguration of the national policy set forth in said resolutions.

The Subsidy Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 20, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 14013) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I avail myself of the opportunity given by the general order of the House authorizing general debate upon the pending measure to discuss the bill which, under the alluring title, "A bill to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States and to provide for the national defense," and better known as the ship-subsidy bill, provides that the Government shall bind itself to subsidize the owners of certain shipping for from twenty to thirty years to come, up to \$9,000,000 a year.

The most striking fact in connection with the ship-subsidy bill is that it does not seem to me to be in the least adapted to secure a single one of its professed aims.

It will not, if passed, encourage the building of American ships owned and manned by Americans and carrying American products to foreign markets. It will not reduce the freights on American commerce with other lands. It will not extend that commerce.

I am opposed to subsidies even if intended to attain the ends above defined, and think they cost more than they come to, tax the many for the few, and in the long run confuse, demoralize, and retard enterprise. By so much more am I opposed to a policy which, while purporting to serve these ends, in my opinion, does not serve them, but only adds to the profits of special interests. In this instance, not only does the bill accomplish, but it seems to seek these unjustifiable objects. It is said, upon good authority, to have been drawn up by a committee of gentlemen directly interested in its proposed bounties, and to have been so shaped in the character of its provisions and the time at which its benefits will accrue that the interests represented by its private authors can and will get almost an exclusive advantage from its operation.

Appeals to national spirit, the pretense of stimulating American export trade, of upbuilding the American merchant marine, have deceived many of our people into the belief that this is a good measure, founded upon sound principles, and, if enacted into law, productive of public good.

Mr. Chairman, the agitation of the shipping question began more than thirty years ago. The thinking people of the country feel that the benefits which must fall to us as a nation as the result of the restoration of our flag upon the high seas through the establishment of an ample marine for our foreign trade should no longer be withheld. The question with which we are confronted is not whether we should restore our merchant marine—to do so

is all important—the question is how we shall restore it, and then how shall we maintain it. Our Government had before it and successfully solved the problem of building our marine in the early days of our national life.

A century ago those who founded the Republic were eager as we are to develop a merchant marine. They saw clearly that it was not a question of shipbuilding. They knew, as we know to-day, that our people can build ships second to none in every requirement. They saw clearly that a merchant marine that would make the American flag a familiar sight in every port and carry the boundary of the Republic to the water's edge of every maritime power was a question of successful operation. Idle ships are as undesirable as idle engines. Employment is as essential to successful ship owning and operating as it is to a person.

To develop our merchant marine the founders of the Republic sought a means by which ships under the American flag could be certain to find employment. This means they found in the simple act of giving to them the preference in the employment furnished by American commerce. They declared that all importations in American bottoms should have a preference of 10 per cent in import duties over the same importations made in foreign bottoms. This preference gave American ships employment, and resulted in a steady increase in the proportion of foreign commerce carried in American ships, until they had nearly all of it—over 90 per cent. Moreover, the domestic or coastwise trade of the United States was limited to American vessels, and shipbuilding was promoted by denying to foreign-built ships the privilege of sailing under the American flag and register.

In so far as relates to the coastwise or domestic trade our original maritime policy is firmly maintained, and to-day the shipping engaged in that branch of our commerce is as prosperous as ever. But by the act of May 24, 1828, we abandoned the protective principle with respect to our shipping engaged in foreign commerce. Under the provisions of that act we offered to allow foreign ships and their cargoes to enter at American ports from any foreign port on the globe, with goods the produce of any country, on the same terms as American vessels, this privilege to apply to the ships of any nation which should grant to American ships and their cargoes like privileges in its own ports.

The blunder of those intrusted with the direction of our Ship of State in not only retaining the act of 1828 upon our statute books after new conditions had arisen which caused it to operate against our shipping interests, but in incorporating the theories for which it stood into our commercial treaties with competing powers, marked the beginning of the loss of American supremacy in merchant shipbuilding and ship operating.

During the period international commerce was carried on in wooden sailing vessels our merchant marine prospered under the policy embodied in the act of 1828. But upon the advent of iron shipbuilding, and especially the construction of iron ocean steamers, the tables were turned upon us. To this result have contributed various circumstances of historic interest. But the lesson taught is no more for us than for any nation that has the problem to solve of how to develop and maintain a merchant marine. Ships under our flag must be given a preference in the employment furnished by our own commerce. All conditions must be studied thoroughly, and in whatever way the ownership and operation of ships under our flag are at a disadvantage in comparison with those of other nations we should offset that disadvantage by a measure that will secure for our ships a preference when seeking employment in any port in the world.

This it is our right and our duty to do. When we did this in the past we secured the business. A full share of the distribution of wealth by payment for such employment came to us. If we shall again apply the principle of protection to our merchant marine that was applied by the founders of the Republic a century ago, judiciously extending and modifying it to meet the requirements of new conditions, it is my opinion a like result will be produced without the expenditure of a single dollar from our National Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, under the principles of sound shipping protection laid down by the fathers our rise as a maritime power took scarcely ten years of time.

Our growth and expansion in proportionate carriage increased from 23 per cent to an average above 90 per cent in our own commerce: from a per capita of ship admeasurement of 3.64 cubic feet to 13.43. But in forty years we passed the summit of our success, and declination had set in, due not to any fault of the shipping interest nor to any failure of the original policy, but to the change of policy whereby we shared with and accorded to foreign ships the rights and privileges which sound principle prompted us to conserve for our own ships exclusively.

The principle of our early shipping measures were reasonable, simple, and wise. The principle of the British law was that of monopoly; the essence of American law was freedom, with preference for the employment of our own vessels. What preference could not secure we let go. Experience shows that in prosperous

trade ships should carry both ways; also, that the merchants and underwriters of every country, as a rule, prefer to employ and insure shipping and property under their own flag. Our export carrying depended mainly for success on the natural preference of our merchants and underwriters for our own ships. Our import carrying could not so depend, foreigners mostly having the say abroad. But inducements could create a preference. How was this effected? By discriminating tonnage and tariff duties. While these continued our ships abroad got cargoes and dispatch even better than at home.

Our proportionate carriage of imports averaged 6 or 7 per cent higher than for exports. Our ships sailed with assurance, carrying the cheaper for being employed both ways. But our policy had no sooner changed than our rivals, by every means at hand, turned the tables on our marine. Equal footing to foreign shipping laid a carpet for alien merchants and underwriters. With these in business, preference for import carrying passed year after year to foreign flags. It became easy for nations importing our staples to get cargoes both ways, while it became hard and then impossible for our ships to get paying freights homeward. Idleness, failure, and "sales abroad" followed. Due protection would have continued our own carrying in our own commerce.

The simple provisions of our early acts would now be insufficient for import employment. The following measures, suggested by Hon. William W. Bates, N. A., a appeal to me most strongly:

1. Extra duties on all merchandise imported by vessels not of the United States or which, being the growth, production, or manufacture of any foreign country not contiguous to the United States, shall come into the United States across the line from any such contiguous country, unless in the course of strictly retail trade.
2. Merchandise on the "free list" to become dutiable at 10 per cent ad valorem when imported in vessels not of the United States.
3. Merchandise on the "reciprocity list" to become dutiable at full rates when imported in vessels not of the reciprocating country or not of the United States.
4. Extra duties of 15 per cent ad valorem on all merchandise admitted to storage in bonded warehouse, unless imported in vessels of the United States.
5. Extra duties of 15 per cent ad valorem on all merchandise imported from countries to which the importing vessels do not belong, except in the case of "reciprocity goods" and vessels of the United States.
6. Extra tonnage duties on the gross admeasurement of all vessels not of the United States that arrive, except in distress, either with or without cargo, from a country or from a port to which any one of them does not belong.

In these measures merchandise bears the brunt of discrimination. Vessels are only affected indirectly, unless bringing cargoes from countries not their own. The difference in duties is preferably made by an extra rate, as that will interfere least with the revenue and revenue questions. The law would tend to limit import carriage to vessels of the countries concerned. This was the primitive rule in commerce and British law until 1850. It respected the rights of all nations, while frowning upon the selfishness of any intent upon engrossing navigation. It is not a right, but a privilege purely, that any foreign vessel shall bring a cargo from a country not her own and in the place of our own ship. Only treaties or conventions can secure such privileges. Both the right and the expediency are with the vessels of the countries exchanging products. If this principle strikes down a bane of trade and source of ruin, it merits the support of the commercial world, and wherein existing conventions and treaties between the United States and other countries prevent now the following of this principle, therein should such conventions and treaties be modified. Particularly should this course be pursued in the case of the powers which discriminate in substance against American products.

The bonding privilege is another prerogative engrossed by foreigners to the exclusion of ourselves. When the warehouse act was passed in 1846, part of the purpose was relief to some extent from cash payment of duties. These had been provided for in the tariff of 1842, but prior our merchants had had a few months' credit. In 1846, also, our shipping, owned mostly by our merchants, was carrying 87 per cent of imports, while citizens were doing 80 per cent of trade. "Bonded goods" are now brought almost wholly by foreign ships for alien importers. The unpaid duties represent millions of indulgence money forborne with our factories and our shipping. Had present conditions existed in 1846, the warehouse system could not have been established.

In all our history there has never been a time so hard as of late to get export freights for American vessels. We have lost our merchants and underwriters along with our ships. The foreigners who have stepped into their shoes have their own nation and flag to work for, and find their personal advantage not in loyalty to the interests of the United States, but in turning to profit the neglect of our rulers. They corrupt our public opinion, intrigue in our politics, and aim to direct commercial and financial administration. They all abhor "regulations of trade" and "protection." Some will cry for "subsidy" if they can get a portion. Subsidize a marine and, with their friends, they would soon own its stock. They hold a heavy hand upon our export commerce and control its carriage, the larger portion of the former being foreign property before leaving interior points. We shall have to

regulate our shipping into this trade—our basic service—or an American marine will never eventuate. Urgent as it is to secure this object, fitting means seem to be few. The following are set out by Mr. Bates, and have commended themselves to me:

1. Extra tonnage duties on the gross admeasurement of all vessels not of the United States that arrive, except in distress, either with or without cargo from a country or from a port to which any one of them does not belong.
2. Light and harbor dues collected as tonnage duties on the gross admeasurement of all vessels not of the United States, except in case of clearing in ballast.
3. Premiums to merchants for freighting American vessels with merchandise or precious metals.

The first of these measures is the same as the sixth for import employment. The second is based on the fact that abroad our vessels are taxed under the same heads. By the act of 1804 we levied on foreign vessels "light duties" of 50 cents a ton. This tax was taken off in 1830; since then foreigners have had "free" lights. The third measure is the only direct and effective one for engagement and dispatch, making employment certain in our own ports.

A percentage on the value of articles shipped, equivalent to double the commission and insurance, might be sufficient. A sailing bounty paid to the vessel would not secure preference, and competition is of no account. The first would not interest the exporter; the second could only make a foreign owner smile. The foreign underwriter will take care of him. But interest the exporter, as suggested, and he would be obliged to find a way to make engagements possible. The extra duties would amply provide the premiums to be paid. If the import and export carrying shall be protected as suggested, suitable measures for mails and passengers would follow. These views and remedies seem to me worthy of deep consideration.

The decadence of American shipping is clearly indicated by statistics, compiled by Mr. Joseph Nimmo, jr., which I borrow. They show the tonnage of American and foreign vessels entered at American seaports during the years 1860, 1870, 1880, 1890, and 1899:

Year.	American tonnage entered.	Foreign tonnage entered.
	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>
1860	3,301,903	1,698,291
1870	2,432,226	3,817,963
1880	3,140,169	12,111,160
1890	3,404,584	11,961,020
1899	3,532,763	18,630,644

The decadence of American shipping employed in our foreign commerce is more strikingly exhibited in Mr. Nimmo's statement showing the total value of imports and exports in American vessels and in foreign vessels during the years ended June 30, 1860, 1870, 1880, 1890, and 1899:

Year.	In American vessels.	In foreign vessels.	Total.	Percent in American vessels.
1860	\$507,247,757	\$255,040,793	\$762,288,550	66.5
1870	352,969,401	638,927,488	991,896,889	35.6
1880	258,346,577	1,224,255,434	1,482,602,011	17.4
1890	202,451,086	1,371,116,744	1,573,567,830	12.8
1899	160,612,206	1,646,263,857	1,806,876,063	8.9

These figures tell the story of the decadence of American shipping as recorded by the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department. The astounding fact disclosed in the latter table is that the total value of our foreign commerce carried in American vessels fell from \$507,247,757 in 1860 to \$160,612,206 in 1899, whereas the value of such commerce carried in foreign vessels increased from \$255,040,793 in 1860 to \$1,646,263,857 in 1899. The percentage of commerce carried in American vessels fell from 66.5 per cent in 1860 to 8.9 per cent in 1899.

The figures are presented in support of practical remedial legislation of the nature enacted by our fathers, but brought down to date. To admit that our shipping ever was protected successfully is to admit that it can be again; moreover, that it should be, rather than subsidized, since the one calls for brains, while the other takes the people's money from them for the benefit of those who need it the least.

In no feature of national legislation has the principle of protection been more wisely and continuously applied than to our ocean-borne coast trade. Into this trade no foreign flag has been permitted to enter. In this trade the American people have consistently and always given the preference of employment to American citizens and American capital. The experience of a century has not shown them to be incapable of serving themselves, and to the degree in which they have served themselves have they grown

richer from this cause. This experience demonstrates beyond the ability of a reasonable doubt that the successful development of a merchant marine is not dependent upon the ability to build ships, but upon the ability to keep them profitably employed. The building of ships is a manufacturing industry. It should be so classed and dealt with. Shipbuilding is related to the merchant marine exactly as engine and car building are related to railroad operation. It is simply equipment. A railroad that can be operated successfully is a constant buyer of engines and cars.

If protection had not enabled American ships to operate successfully in our coast trade, no one would have bought American or any other ships for such use. Not all commodities exchanged in our coast trade are of domestic origin. Imported commodities from all countries find their way into this trade. This fact, however, has never been accepted as a reason for giving any foreign flag the right to carry commodities of its own country from port to port in this country. The coasting trade of the United States is as completely withdrawn from foreign flags as is the trade of the Mississippi River. As to it the result justified the wisdom of our policy. Then, why not apply the same policy to our foreign trade instead of legislating for a favored few by enacting this subsidy bill and arousing our people to renewed protests against our governmental favoritism.

Mr. Chairman, I know of nothing in the history of recent legislation more openly defiant of public interest and sound principle than this measure. The provision of the bill for paying subsidies to foreign-built ships is in itself contrary to the avowed purpose of the measure. It is utterly in conflict with every idea ever put forward by the advocates of subsidies for American shipbuilding. Nevertheless, if subsidies were given to ships bought abroad by any and all Americans, say, for the next twenty years, on the sole condition that an equal number of ships of the same kind should be built in America, it is conceivable that this would add considerably to the number of ships owned by Americans and to the number built here. But that is not what this bill does. It gives subsidies only to the ships built or contracted for prior to the 1st of January, 1900. For what reason such peculiar and valuable privileges should be directly conferred on any class, I do not know, nor have I heard any rational explanation of the plan in Congress, though it is easy enough to understand how it was proposed by the gentlemen who would reap the profit, were the bill to pass. It is to be hoped wiser counsel will prevail and a plan to restore our merchant marine will be devised which will not be open to the criticisms which are directed against this measure.

Two chief beneficiaries under this bill which will profit directly in subsidies are the Standard Oil Company and the International Navigation Company; this latter already has had some experience in leading the American people into special flag waving and hurrahing and spasms of patriotism, while obtaining unearned bounties from the National Treasury. When the postal subsidy law was passed appeals were also made to the national spirit, and the impression was conveyed that the International Company was not particularly favored by the bill, but the contracts with that company entered into under the authority conveyed by the measure when enacted into law bound the Government to pay it \$657,696 a year for this company's vessels trips (53) between New York and Southampton, and \$696,800 a year for the same number of trips between New York and Antwerp, or a total of \$1,354,496 a year. It is not probable this company desires to throw up its mail-subsidy contracts to come under the benefits of the law now proposed were it not to obtain larger returns, both in cold cash and special advantages. That it is moved now by the spirit of lofty patriotism and broad philanthropy in its advocacy of the shipping subsidy bill can not be accepted without question.

The postal subsidy law was shaped particularly to serve this company. So was this subsidy bill now before Congress, and it has the additional purpose to serve the Standard Oil and kindred interests as well. The verbiage of the bill can not hide this fact from anyone who will give it study. Plainly enough it will appear that the measure is not designed to promote the building of shipping which otherwise would not be constructed, but to secure bounties on ships already in operation, or for which contracts have been made or are in contemplation regardless of any subsidies; and much more important than the immense amount of bounty to be levied directly from the people for the benefit of those who do not need it is the impetus it will give to the perfection of a shipbuilding trust, and to its natural sequence, an ocean-carrying trust, thus defeating the very purposes at which the bill ostensibly is aimed.

Mr. Chairman, the shipyards of the country are crowded with orders now, and it would be an easy and richly profitable scheme for the favored few to enter into collusion with them in such a manner as practically to bar out all ordinary aspirants for any of the benefits of the proposed law. Indeed, it is not doubted that the clique behind this bill, banking on its ability to push the measure through, have made the preliminary arrangements to accomplish such a result and to provide against effective new com-

petition in the shipbuilding industry. The tonnage of the steam vessels of the United States has been rapidly increasing in recent years, and is at present the greatest in the history of the country. President McKinley, in his speech at the Chicago commercial banquet, on October 10, 1899, said:

Our shipbuilding has been greatly increased. For the first time in all our history the tonnage of our steam vessels exceeded on June 1 the tonnage of all our sailing vessels, barges, and other craft. We built in 1897 and 1898 more vessels of iron and steel than of all other materials combined. Our tonnage increased during the year 100,000 tons, and is without a parallel in our recent history. More large ocean steamships are under construction in the United States than ever before. Our shipbuilding plants are being enlarged and new establishments planned.

Since President McKinley made that suggestive summary, conditions in relation to shipping have served to emphasize what he then said. There is no more reason and justice why favored interests should have subsidies for ships they have had built, have building, or expect to have built as a good business investment, than that people engaged profitably in other lines of business should have Government bounties added to their receipts. From the report made by John De Witt Warner, at the request of the House committee, showing the extent to which the Standard Oil combine could take advantage of this bill, I present the following table, giving a list of steamers belonging to the Standard Oil fleets, with the tonnage of each and the subsidy-earning capacity of each on the basis of eight round trips per year of 6,900 miles' average at the one-half rate given foreign vessels by the bill:

Name of line and vessel.	Tonnage.	Subsidy.
ANGLO-AMERICAN OIL COMPANY, LONDON.		
Queen of the Avon	4,000	\$13,440.00
Weehawken	2,784	9,354.24
Delaware	3,855	12,952.80
Potomac	3,868	12,996.48
Lackawanna	3,855	12,952.80
Chesapeake	4,557	15,311.52
Tuscarora	6,284	21,114.24
Elbruz	2,742	9,213.12
Genesee	4,000	13,440.00
Suwanee	4,000	13,440.00
AMERICAN PETROLEUM COMPANY, ANTWERP.		
Bremerhaven	3,255	10,936.80
Hainaut	4,000	13,440.00
La Campine	2,595	8,719.20
La Flandre	2,042	6,877.92
La Hesbaye	2,701	9,075.36
AMERICAN PETROLEUM COMPANY, ROTTERDAM.		
American	3,531	11,864.16
Charles	2,743	9,216.48
Chester	2,531	8,504.16
Ocean	2,835	9,525.60
Rotterdam	4,157	13,967.52
DEUTSCHE-AMERIKANISCHE PETROLEUM GESELLSCHAFT, HAMBURG.		
August Korff	4,055	13,624.80
Brilliant	3,189	10,715.04
Burgermeister Petersen	2,788	9,367.68
Deutschland	3,710	12,465.60
Diamant	3,445	11,575.20
Elise Marie	3,193	10,728.48
Energie	2,762	9,280.32
Geestmunde	2,773	9,317.28
Gut Heil	2,691	9,041.76
Mannheim	3,578	12,022.08
Paula	2,703	9,082.08
Standard	2,730	9,172.80
Washington	4,171	14,014.56
Willkommen	3,140	10,550.40
Helios	3,477	11,622.72
Aggregate annual subsidy earnings for 4 Standard Oil lines		398,983.20

How sorely in need of assistance is this Standard Oil combine, which declared dividends last year to the amount of about \$50,000,000 on a capitalization of about \$100,000,000, or 50 per cent per annum!

But this is a modest phase of the bill, as compared with the way it would take care of the company on which the Standard Oil has such a good grip, namely, the International Navigation Company. Briefly expressed, the bill provides for a subsidy range for home-built vessels of from 1 cent to 3.8 cents per ton per 100 miles, and one-half such rates to foreign-built vessels, under the conditions specified. The highest rates are available, not to the ships of the class in which the most of the freight is carried, but to the ones that carry the least of it, though that is by no means the way the bill expresses it.

The statement has not been refuted that the four swift passenger ships of the International Navigation Company, the *New York*, *Philadelphia* (formerly the *Paris*), the *St. Louis*, and *St. Paul*, are the only ones either in existence or building or contracted for that under this bill would receive subsidy at either of the three highest

rates the measure provides. Bearing in mind that the bill is professedly designed "to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States," it is interesting to observe how far profession would be from performance in the operation of the law.

From the fact that the International Navigation Company would receive the lion's share of the subsidy, it has naturally been singled out as the principal object of criticism, more particularly as it is credited with being the prime mover and instigator of the bill. Dealing only with the fleet of this company, the following figures prepared by an expert for the New York Evening Post are interesting:

Estimate of probable earnings per year of the International Navigation Company under the Hanna-Payne subsidy bill.

NEW YORK TO ANTWERP.

Name of vessel.	Knots.	Gross tonnage.	Distance (miles)	Round voy-ages.	Subsidy per ton.	Total sub-sidy.
Westernland.....	14	5,994	3,325	10	\$7.40	\$44,355.90
Noordland.....	13	5,398	3,325	10	4.075	21,996.85
Friesland.....	15	6,824	3,325	10	7.7325	52,764.59
Southwark.....	14	8,607	3,325	10	7.40	63,691.80
Kensington.....	14	8,609	3,325	10	7.40	64,150.60
Total.....						246,961.74

NEW YORK TO SOUTHAMPTON.

New York.....	20	10,674	3,100	16	\$31.16	\$332,601.84
St. Louis.....	21	11,629	3,100	15	32.94	385,059.26
St. Paul.....	21	11,629	3,100	16	34.136	396,967.54
Total.....						1,112,628.64

SUMMARY.

Vessels New York to Antwerp.....	\$246,961.74
Vessels New York to Southampton.....	1,112,628.64
Total.....	1,359,590.38

To the above ought to be added:

Name of vessel.	Knots.	Gross tonnage.	Distance (miles)	Round voy-ages.	Subsidy per ton.	Total sub-sidy.
Vaderland.....	18	12,000	3,325	12	\$11.274	\$135,288.00
Zeeland.....	18	12,000	3,325	12	11.274	135,288.00
Total.....						270,576.00

These vessels are supposed, in this calculation, to sail from New York to Antwerp.

PHILADELPHIA TO LIVERPOOL.

Name of vessel.	Knots.	Gross tonnage.	Distance (miles)	Round voy-ages.	Subsidy per ton.	Total sub-sidy.
Haverford.....	15	10,000	3,100	12	\$8.485	\$84,850.00
Merion.....	14	10,000	3,100	12	8.485	84,850.00
Total.....						169,700.00

The following vessels (not named) are building at Cramps, and it is understood that the minimum speed of these vessels is to be 17 knots. It is supposed that they will sail from New York to Southampton, and that they will be entitled to full subsidy:

Name of vessel.	Knots.	Gross tonnage.	Distance (miles)	Round voy-ages.	Subsidy per ton.	Total sub-sidy.
Not named.....	20	12,000	3,100	14	\$28.14	\$337,680.00
Do.....	20	12,000	3,100	14	28.14	337,680.00
Total.....						675,360.00

Also, the *Paris* will soon be able to resume her work and make at least 14 trips a year. The calculation follows:

Name of vessel.	Knots.	Gross tonnage.	Distance (miles)	Round voy-ages.	Subsidy per ton.	Total sub-sidy.
Paris.....	20	10,660	3,100	14	\$28.14	\$300,225.66

There are also to be considered the 4 small vessels on the Pacific coast, which are capable of earning \$100,189.66.

SUMMARY.

New York to Southampton.....	\$1,359,590.38
New York to Antwerp.....	270,576.00
Philadelphia to Liverpool.....	169,700.00
New York to Southampton.....	675,360.00
The <i>Paris</i> , when restored.....	300,225.66
Ohio, Indiana, Conemaugh, Pennsylvania, on Pacific coast.....	100,189.66
Grand total.....	\$2,875,641.70

The foregoing figures and calculations are not only based upon the present fleet, but the prospective fleet, as announced on the

sailing lists of the International Navigation Company; so that, taking the company's own statement for the tonnage, it is fair to assume that within two years from the passage of the bill their annual income from subsidy alone will amount to not less than \$2,875,641.70.

This is for one company alone. Several others are to profit largely, among them the Standard Oil Company's fleet, as already shown, and the fleet of the Atlantic Transport Company, whose subsidies are estimated at \$537,000 a year.

It is the big and fast ships designed for passengers and fancy freight that would reap the benefits conferred by this bill, and not the transportation adapted to our great American products.

The position of the Republican party in 1896 on the merchant-marine question as compared with the position it now assumes is significant. It recalls to mind unpleasantly a certain incident of recent date when the President pointed out to the Congress "our plain duty" and then failed to follow the path he recommended.

The Massachusetts Republican convention, in 1896, inspired by Senator LODGE, led off in that year with a "discriminating duty" shipping plank, and its example was followed by a dozen or more other State conventions. The national Republican convention made the following declaration:

We favor restoring the American policy of discriminating duties for the upbuilding of our merchant marine and the protection of our shipping in the foreign carrying trade, so that American ships, the product of American labor, employed in American shipyards, sailing under the Stars and Stripes, and manned, officered, and owned by Americans, may regain the carrying of our foreign commerce.

In response, here is what President McKinley, in his letter of acceptance, said:

The declaration of the Republican platform in favor of the upbuilding of our merchant marine has my hearty approval. The policy of discriminating duties in favor of our shipping, which prevailed in the early years of our history, should be again promptly adopted by Congress and vigorously supported until our prestige and supremacy on the seas are fully attained.

"Interests" kindred to those which swayed the Presidential mind in the Porto Rico case from "our plain duty" again seem to be at work.

Mr. Chairman, a bounty shipping bill at best is a mere experiment for us. If it fails, nothing is accomplished and much money lost; if it succeeds, it will cost too much. On the other hand, we have had experience with the regulation of trade and transportation. History tells us what it will do from what it did. This was our early policy toward all nations for twenty-six years, and as to many for a longer time. It is our policy to-day as to nations not in convention with us for a suspension of it for a given time, and, as to those in convention with us, the sooner we modify those conventions in the interest of our merchant marine the better. The French have been nineteen years, and the Italians fifteen, testing the stimulating powers of bounty systems. Both countries are disappointed; the French, that it builds up a marine so slowly; the Italians, that it costs so much more than the treasury can afford.

In 1896 the French Government appointed a special commission to study the shipping situation, the comparative decline of French shipbuilding having aroused their people, while French owning seemed to lag behind commerce discouragingly. In 1898 the commission reported the views of merchants, shipowners, and builders that "a more liberal policy"—increase of bounties to the extent of 40 per cent, at least—should be adopted. This was a leech-like prescription. The annual shipping budget of that country is now above \$8,000,000, and the marine not one-fifth the tonnage needed by the United States. In Italy the shipping budget, now approaching \$2,000,000 annually, greatly concerns the Government. A change in the law of 1896 to protect the treasury from a drain rapidly increasing seems necessary and is meditated by the Government of that country.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe in this bill. It is an unjust conferring of special privileges. The principle is similar to that of the protective tariff, only in a more aggravated form. It is the same taxing of the many for the benefit of the few, but in this case the few are still fewer.

The experience of France in the same line has shown that not even those few are benefited ultimately. There an immense amount of capital was directed into the shipbuilding interest, with the result of greatly increasing competition, with consequent lowering of freight rates to ruinous figures. The people were taxed to build up a special industry, and in the long run that very industry was harmed. On sound economic principles the bill must inevitably be condemned.

Not one sound economic argument can be urged in support of the ship-subsidy bill. The principle involved is a species of paternalism. It has none of the redeeming features of protection and contains all of its fallacies.

If the business of foreign shipping is not profitable without subsidies, either it should be relegated to those who can do it for us cheaper than we can do it for ourselves or it should be encouraged by removing the peculiar barriers which now render it unprofitable. The latter alternative I consider the better course from the standpoint of healthy, broad governmental policy.

Repeal of War Revenue Tax and Ship Subsidies.

We can build ships in this country as well and as cheaply as they can be built anywhere in the world. Now, I had figures within the last year furnished from the best builders on the Clyde, and figures from as good builders as there are in this country, and to my utter amazement the American figures on a single ship were \$25,000 to \$10,000 under (less than) the best Clyde builders. Unfortunately the kind of ship that is to receive the subsidy is one that may need it, but it is one the country at large does not need. I allude to the ocean grayhounds. (J. J. Hill, president Great Northern Railroad, Chicago, December 9, 1900. *Literary Digest*, December 22, 1900.) President Hill, for the Pacific trade, is having built four of the largest steamers in the world, and they are being built in the United States.—*Literary Digest*, *supra*.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. GAINES,

OF TENNESSEE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 14, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 12394) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898, and to reduce taxation thereunder—

Mr. GAINES said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: My time is so limited that I shall not undertake to dissect this bill, but will content myself by quoting from my Republican friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL], who, on yesterday, as the RECORD states, said:

On the basis of the expenditures of the year 1900 the total surplus earned in the three years 1900, 1901, and 1902 would be, with the war-revenue tax in full force, \$286,000,000.

Divide that by three, as it seems to be an estimate based upon that length of time taking 1900 as a basis, and we have an average surplus per year of \$95,000,000, while this bill only proposes to reduce this surplus \$40,000,000. The Democrats insist on a greater reduction of \$70,000,000. The chairman reporting this bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], in his speech, page 237 of the RECORD, said this:

This bill which we bring in here proposes a reduction of \$40,000,000. It is exactly in accordance with what we announced when we brought in the bill two years ago raising the war taxes. We leave \$65,000,000 still to be collected under the war-revenue bill. You will notice that we were to provide for an army of 100,000 men. Both sides agree upon that number as necessary on account of the conditions in the insular possessions of this country that came to us through the Spanish war.

When this war-tax law was enacted there was no statement or argument that our Army should be raised to 100,000 men—not a word to that effect—but this tax is to be, in part at least, continued for that purpose.

The Democrats object to a standing army of 100,000. A standing army we contend is a standing menace to the liberties of the people. Mr. President Polk, in his message to Congress, July 6, 1848, well states the position which the Democratic party has to the present day upheld.

While the people of other countries who live under forms of government less free than our own have been for ages oppressed by taxation to support large standing armies in periods of peace, our experience has shown that such establishments are unnecessary in a republic. Our standing army is to be found in the bosom of society. It is composed of free citizens who are ever ready to take up arms in the service of their country when an emergency requires it.

Our experience in the war just closed fully confirms the opinion that such an army may be raised upon a few weeks' notice, and that our citizen soldiers are equal to any troops in the world. No reason, therefore, is perceived why we should enlarge our land forces, and thereby subject the Treasury to an annual increased charge. Sound public policy requires that we should avoid the creation of a large standing army in a period of peace. No public exigency requires it. Such armies are not only expensive and unnecessary, but may become dangerous to liberty.

He is equally unfortunate in his recollection as to the promise made the people of this country when this war tariff was visited upon them. The Republicans, who now insist on a simple reduction of \$40,000,000, said these war taxes would be repealed as soon as the war with Spain was ended, and although the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] says this war ended nearly two years ago, this war tax is not to be repealed and the people relieved of this military measure in time of peace.

The chairman regrets that the committee is not able to reduce the taxes entirely upon those things which were taxed for and during the Spanish war, although two years have elapsed since the war closed, he says, and we are at a period of profound peace with all nations, and makes other excuses for not keeping this voluntary promise. For example, he says we are to build the "isthmian canal," without stating what the word "isthmian" means in that connection; whether he means the Panama Canal or the Nicaragua Canal. He leaves us in doubt as to his meaning. But I ask, where is the canal bill law? This is a war tariff, but is this

canal a war measure? Is the gentleman ready, with the Democrats, to enact a law to build it? Among other things he says that we will need revenues for the purpose of building a "Pacific cable," and I ask the gentleman, and I ask gentlemen on the other side of the House generally, what the words "Pacific cable" mean in connection with this statement, and whether that was included as a war measure, in their estimates in this bill? Did any one of you, when this war measure was being proposed and enacted by Congress, assert, or even hint, that the building of a Pacific cable was to be one of the war measures for which revenue was being raised under the bill? Not at all. Not a dollar of it was suggested to be so spent.

But the gentleman from New York goes further and says that there are other expenses of the Government that must be met. He says that we must purchase and pay for armor plate. Yet he would keep these war taxes on in a time of profound peace to raise money for the purchase of armor plate, which should be, as it has been, purchased under the Dingley tariff law a peace tariff. Must a war tax be perpetuated for this, when we have bought and can buy armor under a less burdensome tariff?

Again, in another item, he says that the Spanish-war pensions would involve a large expenditure of money and make necessary larger appropriation, in round numbers, about \$5,000,000 more in addition to our ordinary appropriation.

But this bill retains at least thirty millions of war tax. Is that amount retained for Spanish-war pensions? Again I reply, that that tax for our pensioners has always been paid from the bills for raising revenue which originate in times of peace and for peace purposes, and I think the Dingley tariff is ample to take care of them, as the Republicans claim the Dingley tariff is a success. It would seem this war tax is continued to make the Dingley tariff a success—prevent a deficit it perpetuated a long time.

But are these all the reasons to continue this war tax? I think not. The gentleman is most remarkably silent upon that pending bill, the offspring of his own fertile brain and the Senator's from Ohio [Mr. HANNA], the Payne-Hanna ship-subsidy bill. That bill is pending before this body and is being discussed at the other end of the Capitol, but the gentleman fails to say that it is a war expense—is silent on this seductive bill.

We are also told that the Army must be kept up. The President wants 100,000 men, although the war with Spain "ended two years ago," the chairman says. Again, he says we must have 50,000 men for a "permanent Army" in a time of profound peace. We had only about 18,000 men—22,500—all told, when the war with Spain begun. In other words, the gentleman includes the Pacific cable, the ship-subsidy bill, armor-plate purchases, the Spanish-war pensions—all, as war measures.

None of these were claimed as war measures, I repeat, when the revenue bill was being enacted, and it seems to be an afterthought that they are now so characterized. The ship-subsidy bill alone provides for an annual expenditure of \$9,000,000 a year for ten years, and I want to say in this connection, Mr. Chairman, that the ship-subsidy measure has nothing whatever to do with the war. We have had successful wars without ship subsidies. It is not necessary to carry on a war successfully. Then why should the \$65,000,000 remain upon the people of this country without a single item of the Dingley tariff law—the mother of trusts—repealed? Why permit this constant menace, as trusts are, to remain unwhipped when to properly reduce this tax is to crush these trusts?

In other words, they do nothing in this bill to destroy trusts, although altogether feasible, and they do nothing with the law upon the statute books to destroy trusts, because the official record shows that although we have had the McKinley Administration upon us for almost four years, the Attorney-General, in a letter to me in April or May last, shows that he has only filed three suits under the act of 1890 up to that time, passed in both Houses of Congress in that year without a dissenting voice. One of those suits succeeded, one failed, and the other stood then untried, and we do not know yet what the result of it is.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say that the ship-subsidy bill stands before us condemned by what other distinguished men have said upon that subject. When we had our other shipping subsidy propositions, they said that the reason why we could not cope with foreigners in building ships was because of the high tariff upon iron. Mr. Cramp said, in substance, "Remove the tariff on iron and steel; that is all we want. We will then 'overcome' the difference in wages." Mr. Roach supported his contention.

In 1869 the committee of Congress examined John Roach and Charles H. Cramp, large shipbuilders. In reply to a question put by Mr. Morrill as to the average duty on shipbuilding materials, Mr. Cramp said:

About 40 per cent; and if our shipbuilders could be relieved from that, they could compete successfully with foreign shipbuilders. The difference in the cost of labor would be overcome by the superiority of American mechanics. Wooden ships will no longer be built, since iron ships are superior in every respect.

Mr. Roach testified:

America has lost her commerce, and what has she obtained in exchange for it? Simply the right of a few men to charge \$9 per ton in gold on the importation of pig iron. Pig iron is the basis of all other metals connected with the making and repairing of ships. There has been a revolution in shipbuilding, and iron is the material from which they are now built. The high cost of iron produced by the tariff upon it is one of the principal difficulties our commerce has to contend with. I did not come here to ask a bounty. I came here to tell you that while all other articles of American produce are protected to a great extent, there is no protection for American ships. If Congress will take off all the duties from American iron, reducing it to the price of foreign iron, then we are prepared to compete with foreign shipbuilders. The labor question is mistaken. We are prepared to meet that difficulty and to ask no further legislation on the subject.

Senator CHANDLER, on the same subject, in 1872 said:

It is desirable to own iron ships, very desirable, and I hope to see the day when we shall have our old supremacy in shipping; but it never will be done in the world by subsidies. It is not the subsidized lines of Great Britain that pay the largest returns. * * * You will never restore your flag to the ocean by subsidies. I care not how great you may make them; you may increase your subsidies to \$10,000,000 a year and you will not restore your flag.

Senator Morrill, of Maine:

Is it practicable to recall our shipping? I think it is, and by the simplest process. Not a dollar of subsidies. Give us cheap materials, and we will do it. Give us the ground on which we stand, so that we shall have our materials just as cheap as they can be afforded elsewhere, and then all these shipyards and all that skilled labor will be at work at once; and you will find that we shall restore the balance of the shipping interests on the ocean that now stands against us.

While Senator Sherman for free ships said:

Since we can not build these vessels within 20 or 30 per cent of the cost in England, why not admit them free? Why not admit them duty free, raise the American flag upon them, put American officers upon their decks, and have American lines instead of British lines? Why, sir, if that bill should pass, authorizing foreign ships when owned by American citizens, to be used for the present, for three years under the American flag, one-half of the lines between New York and England would be American lines in sixty days.

Subsidies were later again urged, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], February 28, 1879, said:

Now, what is this proposition? Oh, it is to give to John Roach \$3,000,000 as a practical gratuity and to charge that as a tax on the cotton and provisions and tobacco and wheat and grain and breadstuffs and oil that we produce. What for? To enable somebody to sell something that he has made, which it cost \$1.43 to make here, while it costs only a dollar to make it in Europe, and both manufacturers have to go to the same market, namely, Brazil. Why, gentlemen, if you had a business agent who proposed to do your private business in that way you would put him into a lunatic asylum or swear that he was a thief or an idiot and discharge him.

And on the amount of subsidy paid out he said:

Commencing in the year 1847 down to the present time (1879) act after act has been passed for a similar purpose (postal subsidies). I hold in my hand the official statements of the Secretary of the Navy and the Postmaster-General, which show payments of subsidies to the amount, in round numbers, of \$14,500,000 to steamship lines during the period from the year 1848 to 1853. I hold in my hand a statement that shows subsidies to the amount of \$7,000,000, in round numbers, since that time, making over \$21,000,000 that have been paid out of the Treasury for the purpose of establishing steamship lines. Seven million dollars would buy all the steamships engaged in commerce that sail under the American flag on every ocean in the world—and more than that, the subsidizing of these steamship lines, from the "Collins" line in 1832 up to the present time, has bankrupted every prominent man that has favored it.

Mr. Chairman, we are now the largest and cheapest iron and steel producing country in the world, not only, if you please, shipping our iron in its raw state throughout the civilized world, but shipping the finished products of this country to civilized nations. And, quoting the words of my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE]:

What we have so often predicted in the past as the result of our tariff laws, bringing our artisans up to that point of perfection where they can compete in the markets of the world, has already transpired, and we are marching on in that respect.

Then why this ship subsidy? The cheapest iron and steel in the world and our artisans where they can compete with the markets of the world! Why this bounty, and that, too, to the wealthy men, able to buy anything they want? Why retain this war tax to pay this unnecessary gratuity?

It is clearly not needed, even if ship subsidy is a war measure; nor can it be classed as a war expenditure. Then why, I submit, continue a surplus war tax of \$65,000,000 to meet them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, I append as part of my remarks an editorial from the New York Post of December 28, 1900:

SHIP-SUBSIDY HUMBUGS.

The facts which militate most strongly against the ship-subsidy bill are the items of news which are constantly appearing in the newspapers. Here, for example, is one which was published December 21:

"AMERICAN STEEL PLATES CHEAPEST.

"GLASGOW, December 20.

"Clyde shipbuilders recently placed orders for 150,000 tons of steel plates in the United States, at a saving of £50,000 (\$250,000). The depression in the Scotch steel and malleable-iron trades is acute. Fourteen furnaces will be

damped at the end of the year. The steel works are talking of closing indefinitely."

This is one of the notorious facts relating to the comparative cost of shipbuilding here and abroad, yet they are generally ignored by those who are demanding the ship subsidy. There was a time, before we had commenced to do much in the way of building iron and steel ships, when such ships could be built more cheaply in England than here; but as far back as 1869, when a committee was appointed by Congress to investigate shipping interests, John Roach testified: "If Congress will take off the duties from American iron, reducing it to the price of foreign iron, then we are prepared to compete with foreign shipbuilders. The labor question is mistaken. We are prepared to meet that difficulty and to ask no further legislation on the subject."

As a result of this representation, Congress long ago put all materials for shipbuilding for the foreign trade on the free list, but the change of trade conditions has made even that unnecessary. Now we can sell at a profit in Great Britain steel plates and even coal coming from Pennsylvania, and with the cheaper price of American wood and the superiority of American machinery and of American workmen, the trade conditions are already in our favor as a result of a perfectly natural and healthy outgrowth of our own resources and abilities. Aside from the iniquity of the subsidy bill as a piece of State socialism and class legislation, there is no more reason for subsidized American shipyards than for subsidized American bicycle factories.

Nor is there any justification for a subsidy on the ground of the higher wages of an American crew. American wages, as a whole, are considerably higher than wages abroad; but the fact that we can compete in innumerable manufactured articles with any foreign nation shows that for a given result American labor costs no more per unit of work done than the less efficient foreign labor. But, even if there were no element of increased efficiency represented by the higher American wages, this ship-subsidy bill is not even drawn so as to meet that difficulty. This is one of the points on which this bill, which starts out with a spectacular appeal to American patriotism by claiming that it will increase the number of American sailors, utterly breaks down when it comes to the test of manning the subsidized ships. The bill purports to require that at least one-fourth of the crew of a subsidized ship shall be United States citizens, but this requirement is absolutely neutralized by the provision that "if an American crew can not be reasonably obtained," foreigners may be hired; that is, the shipowner may offer wages at the market rate, and if Americans will not ship at that rate he may make up a crew of foreigners. In other words, after having been compensated in advance out of the public taxes because he said that he was obliged to pay high American wages, he may, nevertheless, for all that the bill contains, go on paying the market rate and pocket the subsidy.

This clamor for a ship subsidy is a fair sample of what may be expected from corporate interests which have once tasted the advantages of governmental interference in their behalf; for there is virtually no other industry which at present receives greater benefits from the Government. In addition to the free raw materials (even if those were necessary to meet competition, as they are not), our navigation laws prohibit the registry by Americans of foreign-built ships. They absolutely prohibit foreign vessels from engaging in the enormous American coastwise commerce—and this is a provision which has no counterpart in British law. All naval vessels are built at home in time of peace, and under the existing postal subsidy the United States pays almost twice as much subsidy per ton on its sea-going steam tonnage as Great Britain.

Attention has been directed more than once to the fact that this bill gives the largest subsidies to the fast-sailing passenger ships which carry little freight, although the pretense is made that it is a bill to promote the export trade. The New York Press, a pretty sound Republican paper, has at last taken notice of this fact and advises the friends of the bill to drop this feature of it and make it what it purports to be, a bill to promote commerce rather than excursion parties to Europe. In order to save the bill, the Press urges Senator HANNA to "set the American Line Jonahs ashore," and the Tribune apparently indorses the sentiment by reprinting it in a conspicuous place. Mr. J. A. Heckman, whose name we seem to remember in connection with the Shayne association and the baggage controversy, writes to us also protesting against legislation whose design or tendency is to furnish cheap fares at the public expense for tourists who go abroad to get their clothes. We agree fully with Mr. Heckman as to this.

I will also insert the following:

THE PROMPT EXTENSION OF OUR TARIFF AND COMMERCE LAWS TO THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA AS SOON AS THE TREATY IS RATIFIED ACQUIRING IT, MADE BY THE JUDGMENT AND ORDER OF MR. SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY McCULLOCH, IN 1865, AND MR. SECRETARY OF STATE SEWARD, IN 1869.

The treaty by which we acquired Alaska was proclaimed June 20, 1867. Following the departmental rule and law promulgated by the Administration of President Polk as to our California territory, and upheld by the Supreme Court in *Cross vs. Harrison*, reported in 16 Howard, Mr. Secretary McCulloch as early as March 5, 1868, directed that:

Furs from the Hawaiian Islands in American vessels, certified by a resident United States consul as products of Alaska, procured by American whaling vessels in Alaska, the landing of which was a mere incident to transportation to the United States, are admitted to entry free of duty. (Synopsis of Decisions of the Treasury of the United States, March 5, 1865.)

At a later date (April 6, 1868) the following official letter, directing that Alaskan oil be admitted free of duty, was issued:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, April 6, 1868.

SIR: Your communication of February 7 is received, reporting upon the letter of the Secretary of State relative to the request of the Russian minister for the free entry of certain oil shipped from Sitka for San Francisco and reshipped thence to your port in bond.

The request for the free entry of said oil was made on the ground that the oil was shipped from Sitka after the ratification of the treaty by which the Territory of Alaska became the property of the United States.

The treaty in question was ratified on the 30th day of June, 1867, and the collector at San Francisco has reported that the manifest of the vessel shows the oil to have been shipped from Alaska on the 6th day of July, 1867, and that the shipment consisted of 52 packages.

Under these circumstances you are hereby authorized to admit said 52 packages of oil to entry free of duty.

Please report your action under these instructions.

I am, very respectfully,

HUGH McCULLOCH, Secretary.

H. A. SMYTHE, Esq.,
Collector, New York.

Here are two holdings of the Secretary of the Treasury, following the judgment of the court in the Cross-Harrison case and the rulings of the Polk Administration upon the same subject, and upon which the opinion in this case was based.

Our commerce laws with Indian tribes, enacted in 1834, the law of Alaska, acquired thirty-three years thereafter.

Mr. Secretary Seward, in 1869, gave official instruction to General Schofield, then Secretary of War, to the effect that the act of 1834 was the law of Alaska the moment we acquired that territory, and without any new legislation, citing and approving the Cross-Harrison case. We have here, then, not only our "revenue" or tariff laws, but our "commerce" laws with Indian tribes applied to this new territory.

The following is Mr. Seward's letter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 30, 1869.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th instant, inclosing extracts from a communication from Mr. F. M. Smith, jr., concerning the alleged habitual encroachment of the agents of the Hudson Bay Company upon the trade and Territory of Alaska, with a request for my views upon the subject.

By the sixth article of our treaty with Russia of March 30, 1867, the cession of the territory and dominion therein made is "declared to be free and unincumbered by any reservations, privileges, franchises, grants, or possessions by any associated companies, whether corporate or incorporate, Russian or any other, or by any parties except merely private individual property holders."

Article 5 of the treaty between Great Britain and Russia, of February 28, 1825 (3 Hertale's Treaties, 364), which was revived and continued by the seventeenth article of the treaty between the same powers of January 12, 1869 (10 Hertale, 1063), provides that "no establishment shall be formed by either of the two parties within the limits assigned by the two preceding articles to the possessions of the other; consequently British subjects shall not form any establishment either upon the coast or upon the border of the continent comprised within the limits of the Russian possessions." The article referred to established the boundary lines between the British and Russian possessions on the northwest coast of America, the same adopted in our treaty of cession with Russia.

The provisions above cited are conclusive against the right of the Hudson Bay Company to establish or maintain such an establishment as Fort Yukon is described to be in the communication of Mr. F. M. Smith, jr.

I understand the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Harrison vs. Cross* (16 Howard, 164-202) to declare its opinion that upon the addition to the United States of new territory by conquest and cession the acts regulating foreign commerce attach to and take effect within such territory ipso facto, and without any fresh act of legislation expressly giving such extension to the preexisting laws. I can see no reason for discrimination in this respect between acts regulating foreign commerce and the laws regulating intercourse with the Indian tribes. There is, indeed, a strong analogy in the two subjects.

The Indians, if not foreigners, are not citizens, and their tribes have the character of dependent nations under the protection of this Government. As Chief Justice Marshall remarks, delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court in *Worcester vs. The State of Georgia* (6 Peters, 537), "the treaties and laws of the United States contemplate the Indian Territory as completely separated from that of the States and provide that all intercourse with them shall be carried on exclusively by the Government of the Union." The same clause of the Constitution invests Congress with power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations . . . and with the Indian tribes."

The act of June 30, 1834 (4 Stat., 729) defines the "Indian country" as in fact "all that part of the United States west of the Mississippi and not within the States of Missouri and Louisiana or the Territory of Arkansas." This, by a happy elasticity of expression, widening as our domain widens, includes the territory ceded by Russia. That act provides that no person shall trade with any of the Indians (in the Indian country) without a license; that any person other than an Indian who shall attempt to reside in the Indian country as a trader, or to introduce goods or to trade therein without said license, shall forfeit all merchandise offered for sale to the Indians or found in his possession, and shall, moreover, forfeit the sum of \$500; that no license to trade with the Indians shall be granted to any persons except citizens of the United States; that a foreigner going into the Indian country without a passport from the War Department, the Superintendent or Agent of Indian Affairs, or the officer commanding the nearest military post on the frontiers, shall be liable to a fine of \$1,000; finally, that the Superintendent of Indian Affairs and Indian agents or subagents shall have authority to remove from the Indian country all persons found therein contrary to law, and the President is authorized to direct the military force to be employed in such removal.

These provisions seem to be all that can be necessary in the way of legislation to prevent the encroachments of the Hudson's Bay Company alleged by Mr. F. M. Smith, jr.

Of the practical difficulties in the execution of these provisions you have better means of judging than this Department.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant.

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Hon. J. M. SCHOFIELD,
Secretary of War.

It should be remembered that the lamented and distinguished William M. Evarts was at this time (1869) the legal adviser of the Administration—that is, the Attorney-General of the United States—and it is supposed he was advised with before this opinion was issued.

There are two Alaskan cases in point—*Nelson vs. United States* (30 Fed. Rep.), where the Constitution was held to apply and protect the people in their fundamental rights, and the *Indian Slave Case* (31 Fed. Rep.), who was given his liberty under habeas corpus proceedings. Or, to state it still more strongly, in the words of Justice Curtis, in the case of *United States vs. Morris*, reported in *Great Opinions by Great Judges* and 1 Curtis Rep.:

Nothing can be clearer than the intention to have the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States in equal force throughout every part of the territory of the United States alike, in all places and at all times.

Louisiana Purchase Exposition.

This accession of territory strengthens forever the power of the United States, and I have just given to England a maritime rival that will sooner or later humble her pride.—*Napoleon*.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. TAWNEY,

OF MINNESOTA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, February 18, 1901.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 9629) to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory by the United States by holding an international exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, mine, forest, and sea in the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri—

Mr. TAWNEY said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The present Congress, by an act approved June 6, 1900, provided as follows:

For defraying the expenses of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Commission, when appointed, \$10,000; and when the Louisiana Purchase Exposition of 1903, a corporation under the laws of the State of Missouri, shall have raised to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury \$10,000,000 for and on account of inaugurating and carrying forward an exposition at St. Louis, Mo., to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory by the United States, then the United States will authorize the expenditure of the sum of \$3,000,000 for such exposition, to be disbursed under the direction of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition of 1903, under rules and regulations and under conditions to be hereafter prescribed by Congress.

THE FAITH OF THE GOVERNMENT PLIGHTED.

By the terms of this act this Congress plighted the faith of the Government to the people of St. Louis and to the people of all the States and Territories formed out of the Louisiana purchase, to authorize an international exposition, create a national commission, and appropriate \$5,000,000 for the purpose specified in the act from which I have just read. The people of St. Louis and the State of Missouri having complied with all of the conditions we imposed, we are now in honor bound to perform the part we agreed at our last session the Government would take in aiding these people in their effort to inaugurate an exposition in commemoration of one of the greatest international events in our history and to make the proposed exposition for that purpose the greatest and the grandest the world has ever seen.

THE MAIN PROVISIONS OF THE BILL.

Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration contemplates the full accomplishment of this purpose. It specifically authorizes an international exposition at the city of St. Louis to be opened not later than May 1, 1903, and to be closed not later than December 1 of the same year. By it we will also appropriate \$5,000,000, as we have agreed to do, to aid in the inauguration and success of this proposed celebration. It also authorizes the erection of a Government building, and appropriates \$250,000 for that purpose. It authorizes a Government exhibit, and contains many other provisions in respect to the details of this proposed exposition, to which I shall refer later on.

The principal condition, the performance of which by the people of St. Louis binds us to enact some such measure as your special committee has reported, is that the people of St. Louis shall have first raised "to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury the sum of \$10,000,000 for and on account of inaugurating and carrying forward" this exposition. That this has been done is fully shown by a letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, which I will print as part of my remarks:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 6, 1901.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to state that there has been submitted to me satisfactory evidence that the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company has raised, by subscription pledges from good and responsible parties, more than \$5,000,000, and by valid ordinance of the city of St. Louis a contribution of \$5,000,000, making in all the sum of \$10,000,000, which has thus been raised available to the exposition company as its needs may require.

Very truly, yours,

L. J. GAGE, Secretary.

Hon. J. A. TAWNEY,
Chairman Committee on the Centennial
of the Louisiana Purchase, House of Representatives.

Having thus complied with everything we demanded as a condition precedent to the authorization of this exposition and the appropriation of the amount specified, there is nothing, in the judgment of your special committee, for Congress to do or to determine but to make the appropriation, prescribe the conditions upon which the same is to be expended, and define the powers and limitations of the national commission and of the local corporation under whose joint control and supervision the exposition is to be inaugurated and carried on. This, we believe, will be fully accomplished by the passage of this bill.

My time will not admit of a full and complete statement of the details of this measure, and for that reason I shall print as a part of my remarks the report of the special committee which accompanies the bill.

In its preparation due consideration was given to laws heretofore passed for a similar purpose, and the experience of the Government and of the local authorities in the administration of these laws was fully investigated. The result of this consideration and investigation prompted the committee to materially change the plan for the joint control of this exposition from that heretofore adopted by Congress, especially the World's Columbian Exposition. This exposition was conducted under the general supervision and control of a national commission created by an act of Congress, and a local corporation created under the laws of the State of Illinois. Their powers in many instances were coequal and their jurisdiction over the exposition concurrent, which led to many very embarrassing situations and a great deal of turmoil and strife between these two bodies.

Very early in the work of inaugurating the World's Columbian Exposition differences arose between these two bodies, and I am informed by gentlemen who were connected with the control and management of that exposition that these differences at times became so acute as to threaten the abandonment of the exposition. The chief difficulty arose out of the fact that the national commission was too large. That body consisted of two members from every State and Territory in the Union and nine at large. They were appointed by the President upon the recommendation of the governors of the several States. They were allowed \$6 a day for subsistence and traveling expenses. Upon examining the report of the commission and the records of the Treasury Department it was found that this national commission cost the Government in per diem allowances and traveling expenses \$497,685. The national commission was also authorized to appoint a board of lady managers, consisting of two from each State and Territory, for the members of which board there was provided a per diem allowance and traveling expenses. This board of lady managers cost the Government \$239,190.

It was thought by your committee that a commission of nine would be far more effective in the wise administration of the Government's interest in this exposition and certainly far less expensive. We have, therefore, provided for the appointment of a commission of only nine, the appointments to be made by the President, in his discretion. This commission will be authorized to appoint a board of lady managers, subject, however, to the approval of the local corporation. This was deemed only fair, because the expenses of this board must be paid by that corporation.

It is also provided, in section 19 of the bill, that all sums of money expended by the Government on account of this proposed exposition shall be paid out of the appropriation of \$5,000,000, except the cost of the Government building or buildings and the making and caring for the Government exhibit. So that there will be no opportunity for the friends of this exposition to come to Congress in the future, or for the national commission to ask for any further appropriation to defray expenses incurred on behalf of the Government other than that made by this bill. All expenditures made or obligations incurred by the Government must be incurred with the approval of and the expenditures paid by the local corporation, except those otherwise expressly provided for. So that while the national commission will have general supervisory control over the exposition it can not incur any obligation on account of the Government that will necessitate a further appropriation unless authority for that purpose is hereafter given by Congress.

THE BOARD OF ARBITRATION.

To obviate the difficulties that grew out of the concurrent jurisdiction, control, and management of the World's Columbian Exposition by the national commission and the local authorities, we have provided for a board of arbitration. This board is to consist of two members of the national commission and two members of the local corporation. To it all differences which the two bodies are not able to settle amicably must be referred for determination. In the event of the failure of these four men to agree they are authorized to select a fifth member, and if they are unable to agree upon such fifth member the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to select him.

ALLOTMENT OF SPACE BY LOCAL CORPORATION.

We also discovered in our investigation what to the committee appeared to be a grievous mistake in the act authorizing the World's Columbian Exposition. That act authorized the national commission to "allot space for exhibitors, prepare a classification of exhibits, determine the plan and scope of the exposition, appoint all judges and examiners for the exposition, award all premiums," etc. This work involved a vast amount of expense which, in the judgment of the national commission, should be borne by the local corporation. The national commission accordingly demanded the performance of this duty and the payment of

this expense by the local corporation, but that body replied: "We have the show; we have the gate receipts, and under the act it is your duty to perform this work, and the Government must defray the expense." In consequence of this a board of Government control was created by an act of Congress, and this board cost the Government in salaries and other expenses almost a million dollars, or, to be exact, \$909,000.

Believing that this burden should rest upon the local corporation, we have provided that the allotment of space for exhibitors, classification of exhibits, plan and scope of the exposition, appointment of all judges and examiners for the exposition, and the awarding of all premiums shall be done and performed by the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company instead of by the national commission, but subject to the approval of the national commission. By giving the national commission the right of approval we enable that body, as the representative of the National Government, to protect all foreign exhibitors in their rights in dealing with the exposition company, which it is the duty of the Government to do.

This, Mr. Speaker, in brief explains the main features of this measure, the difference between its provisions and the provisions of previous laws enacted for similar purposes, and the reason for the changes the committee has made.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN EXPOSITIONS AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS AND THOSE PARTICIPATED IN BY THE GOVERNMENT AS AN EXHIBITOR.

The only opposition to the passage of this measure comes from those who claim we have already gone too extensively into the "show business." Because of the number of expositions held in recent years and the number now on the way, I have heard members say: "It is about time for the Government to go out of the 'show business.'" The time may have come, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] remarked the other day, "for the Government to go out of the side-show business," but I do not think the time should ever come when the American people should be denied Congressional authority and Federal aid for the appropriate celebration of those great and far-reaching events in their history which distinctly mark the beginning and progress of our national life and great industrial development—events which, in less than a century and a quarter, have made our nation a world power and compelled respect for its flag, whether on land or on sea, or wherever it floats on the planet. It may, therefore, be of interest, in view of this criticism, to know that previous to this time Congress has authorized and directly aided only two international expositions. The first was to commemorate the centennial anniversary of the birth of American independence at the city of Philadelphia, the second to commemorate the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of our country at the city of Chicago. All other expositions have been held under State authority, where the Federal Government, like the States, was merely a participant in the form of an exhibitor.

Congress having never authorized or aided but two international expositions there is no ground whatever, no justification for the claim that the Louisiana Purchase Exposition should not be authorized, unless the event is not of sufficient importance to justify the exercise of national authority for that purpose and the expenditure of money from the Federal Treasury.

But, in my judgment, we have no right to withhold our support from this measure upon this or any other ground. By the act from which I quoted at the beginning of my remarks I maintain that the Government is as completely bound to give authority for this exposition and appropriate money for the same as an individual would be bound to comply with the conditions of his solemn contract. The people of St. Louis having complied in every particular with the conditions which Congress imposed, the contract, so far as they are concerned, is now an executed one, and there is nothing for us to consider, as I said before, except the manner in which the appropriation is to be expended and the limitations and restrictions upon the powers and authority of the two bodies under which the exposition is to be given.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE EVENT TO BE CELEBRATED.

But, if we stop and consider the importance of the event which it is proposed to commemorate, we must all admit that it justly occupies a place by the side of our triumph for liberty and the victory of the Union over the notion of a States rights confederacy. The glory of this achievement and the memory of the men who wrought it by peacefully plucking from both Great Britain and France that splendid piece of territory out of which we have carved twelve of the brightest stars that now adorn our national firmament, deserves to be commemorated in a manner befitting a nation which by that acquisition has become the greatest nation on earth.

By this achievement the policy of American territorial expansion was inaugurated by the founders of our Republic. By it they annexed an empire greater in extent than the States then comprising the Union; an empire seven times greater than that of Great Britain and Ireland; more than four times the size of the German Empire or of France; three times greater than that of

Spain and Portugal; an empire even greater in area than Great Britain, Germany, France, Spain, Portugal, and Italy combined.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE EVENT IN THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PURCHASE.

But it is not the magnitude or territorial extent of this purchase that makes its acquisition one of the most important events in our national life. It is the wisdom, the farsighted statesmanship of the men who saw the opportunity of strengthening forever the power of the United States, and who had the courage to take advantage of it, and thus insure our future peace with all European nations, together with the magnificent result we, as a nation, have achieved with this territory, a part of the United States, that marks this event as one of the greatest in our history, and that has created in the hearts of the people the patriotic desire to commemorate appropriately this grand achievement wrought by the founders of our Republic by the peaceful acquisition of this imperial domain.

There is no fact in our national history that speaks more eloquently in behalf of the progressive spirit of our people than the development wrought throughout this territory in the last century. With the extension of American sovereignty over this domain came the American husbandman, artisan, and merchant trader, not for the purpose of preying upon the native red man, as the Spanish, English, and French had done for more than a century, but to settle and develop the country, to make happy, prosperous, and free homes, to add to the national wealth, and to open the way for the more rapid advance of Christian civilization.

At the time of this purchase nineteen-twentieths of the territory embraced in it was unpeopled save by wild beasts and savages. The rivers flowed unvexed by the fretting wheels of commerce; on the broad prairies the flowers bloomed and died with none to note their beauty or enjoy their fragrance; luxuriant grasses ripened in summer airs, rotted, and enriched a soil on which no harvest waved. In less than half a century all this was changed. The strong hand of the early pioneer was laid upon the mighty forces of nature, bringing them under his complete control.

Things seemingly impossible at the time of the acquisition of this territory have been realized. Harvests now ripen in the fields; villages cluster in the valleys; cities sit queen-like by the side of lakes and rivers, where, within the memory of men yet living, blazed the wigwam fires of the noble red man; mines are rapidly giving up their hoarded wealth; hammers thunder in mills and factories; steamers come and go; by the steel rail the flying train now traverses almost every foot of this territory; from one end of it to the other lightning leaps responsive to the voice and touch of man; schoolhouses are everywhere seen, while on every prairie and in every valley throughout this vast domain church spires point toward heaven.

Nowhere in the history of the world can be found a more marvelous development in the short space of one hundred years than that wrought by the people inhabiting the States formed out of the Louisiana purchase, which fact they will have an opportunity of exhibition to the world at this proposed exposition.

THE PRODUCTION AND WEALTH OF THIS PURCHASE IN 1890.

The report of the Secretary of Agriculture in 1890 shows that in that year the territory within the Louisiana purchase produced 1,145,187,081 bushels of corn, 151,895,785 bushels of wheat, and 260,822,173 bushels of oats. The aggregate value of these three cereals for that year was \$344,961,193. In 1890, or within eighty-seven years from the time of this purchase, the real and personal property belonging to the people within this territory aggregated \$3,190,456,461.

But it is not alone the people of these States that will be benefited; the opportunity will also be afforded the people of all the States to join with the people of the Louisiana Purchase States in exhibiting to the world our marvelous progress and development since the Columbian Exposition. It will then have been ten years since that exposition was held. We to-day occupy a far more important position in the family of nations than we did then.

We are now a world power. According to Mulhall, we are richer than those countries whose possessions extend around the globe, and our power is recognized and respected by every civilized country on the planet. Never was there a more opportune time in our history for us to entertain the nations of the world than now. Our people never had a greater or a more sincere pride in the record of their country than they have to-day. Every nation will gladly respond to the invitation we will extend to them to participate in this exposition, to visit our land and witness our great progress in commerce, in industry, in the arts and sciences, and in all things essential to national power and greatness, and to the happiness and comfort of man.

BLAINE'S ESTIMATE OF THE VALUE OF THIS PURCHASE.

The importance to the nation of the acquisition of this territory and that this event should be appropriately commemorated has commanded the attention of the American people and of American statesmen for many years. On March 31, 1887, Hon. James G.

Blaine, speaking in the Merchants' Exchange in the city of St. Louis, said:

Your growth, gentlemen, is the growth of the Republic. In a peculiar sense your growth is the growth of the trans-Mississippi republic, a republic which is a far greater one, a far grander one, a far richer one than the Federal Union was when Missouri became a member of it. And it is in that great region hitherto and as yet scarcely developed that this city is to have its imperial growth and enormous development.

But, gentlemen, with all the congratulations that I feel it is in my heart to extend to you, with all the compliments which your immense growth calls from every lip, I feel that I have one reproach against St. Louis, I feel that I have one reproach against this great trans-Mississippi department. A little over eighty years ago it belonged to a foreign power, and by the narrowest possible chance was kept from falling into the hands of England; but the watchful care, the great nerve and courage, the statesmanlike grasp of Thomas Jefferson, standing between the policy of France and the aggressive energy of Great Britain, plucked the whole territory of Louisiana from them both and made it into an American State; and that vast domain for which Jefferson gave \$15,000,000 is now represented in 7 great and prosperous States and 3 large Territories which in the course of time will add 4 or 5 States possibly to the American Union.

Never was a conquest so great, so extensive, acquired by peaceful methods. Never was so great a conquest made by war that a conquering power was able to hold. Then let me say that my reproach to St. Louis, my reproach to every foot and every inhabitant of the Territory of Louisiana, is that on its surface, which represents a third part of the United States, there is not a statue raised to the honor of Thomas Jefferson.

St. Louis is the capital, the emporium, and will be for all time of that which was the Territory of Louisiana. I will be forgiven, I am sure, for reminding you that gratitude to the great man who has gone, gratitude to that great man who in the annals of American greatness should stand next to Washington; I will be forgiven, I am sure, when I say that the duty of St. Louis and the merchants of St. Louis is to erect within your beautiful city a statue of him who, more than any other man, by a scratch of a pen created an empire. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] has six and a half minutes remaining.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to the provision of the sundry civil bill which creates the obligation which we are now seeking to fulfill. It is in these words: "That when the sum of \$10,000,000 shall have been raised by the exposition company"

Now, I quote exactly:

Then the United States will authorize the expenditure of the sum of \$5,000,000 for such exposition, to be disbursed under the direction of "The Louisiana Purchase Exposition of 1903," under rules and regulations and under conditions to be hereafter prescribed by the Congress.

Now, my question is, Why do we not fulfill completely the obligation of Congress if we appropriate \$5,000,000 to be expended for this exposition? That is the letter of the promise that we make, and it seems to me that it is the spirit of the promise that we make, and that this creation of a great machine which will inevitably run us into debt millions of dollars more, this creation is outside of the promise we made. Our promise simply was to expend \$5,000,000 on that exposition.

Mr. TAWNEY. Oh, no, that is not all.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell me where else there was any promise?

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman will read the whole of that provision.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I have here the sundry civil bill of last year containing the provision.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman will read that provision of the sundry civil bill he will find it is as follows:

That said sum of \$5,000,000 shall not be expended until the said sum of \$10,000,000 raised by said Louisiana Purchase Exposition of 1903 shall have been expended for and on account of said exposition, and there shall be repaid into the Treasury of the United States the same proportionate amount of the aid given by the United States as shall be repaid to either the corporation or the city of St. Louis.

And provided further, That all sums expended by the Government on account of said exposition, except for its own buildings and exhibits and the care of the same, shall be deducted from any general appropriation made for said exposition.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Yes; but that does not in any way engage that the expenditure shall be more than \$5,000,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. Are you complaining that we have not required that the expenditure for the Government building and the exhibits and care of the same shall be paid out of the five million? That is what I understood you to complain of.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. That is one reason; not the only one. Here is the promissory language:

Then the United States will authorize the expenditure of the sum of \$5,000,000 for such exposition.

This bill probably authorizes the expenditure of six and a half million dollars, and makes inevitable an expenditure of many more hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. TAWNEY. There is no basis whatever for your conclusion.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Not necessarily; but we know in practice that it will.

Mr. TAWNEY. There is no precedent to justify the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts, because no appropriation has ever been made to aid in carrying forward an international exposition under such conditions as we impose by this bill. We have provided absolutely that every dollar of money that we are required to expend, except for our building and exhibit, must come out of this \$5,000,000 appropriation, and not a dollar of the 5,000,000 can be expended except for the salaries and expenses of the commission until the people of St. Louis have expended \$10,000,000.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Why not appropriate \$5,000,000 in the sundry civil bill, under the conditions named in last year's sundry civil bill, and have done with it?

Mr. TAWNEY. We have not only promised to appropriate this money, but we have also promised to authorize the creation of a commission and the holding of this exposition. This is declared in the first part of the provision from which the gentleman has read.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts (reading):

For defraying the expenses of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Commission, when appointed.

Mr. TAWNEY. By implication we have committed the Government to the creation of this commission and to the holding of this international exposition, and upon the strength of that implied promise the people of St. Louis have raised \$10,000,000. They have performed the herculean task of raising \$10,000,000 in less than a year's time for the purpose of carrying on this exposition, a task it is doubtful if any other municipality in the world could perform in the same length of time. This being so, it would be a disgrace for the same Congress that made the pledge, without which this work would not have been performed, to now fail to keep it in spirit as well as in letter.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I am in favor of giving them \$5,000,000, as promised.

Mr. TAWNEY. I am also in favor of giving them the authority for the holding of this exposition, which is intended to be an international exposition, so that foreign countries when they come here as visitors or exhibitors will understand that they have not been invited to attend a State fair, but to an exposition held under the authority of the United States Government—an exposition held for the purpose of commemorating the first and greatest international event in our history.

Mr. LANDIS. Do I understand that this bill makes the Government liable for more than \$5,000,000?

Mr. TAWNEY. Not a dollar except for its own buildings, and the making of its own exhibit.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The exhibit is directed?

Mr. TAWNEY. The exhibit is directed.

Mr. CORLISS. May I suggest to the gentleman from Minnesota that it provides that the Government shall not be liable for one dollar of obligation beyond the appropriation?

Mr. TAWNEY. It provides that the Government, under no circumstances, shall be liable for any act or for any obligation incurred by the national committee or the local corporation in the carrying on of this exposition.

Mr. TAWNEY, from the Committee on the Centennial of the Louisiana Purchase, submitted the following report (to accompany H. R. 9829):

[House Report No. 2765, Fifty-sixth Congress, second session.]

The Special Committee on the Centennial of the Louisiana Purchase, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9829) to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana Territory by the United States by holding an international exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, mine, forest, and sea in the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, reports the same back to the House with the recommendation that it be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the following, and that the bill as thus amended do pass:

"A bill to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory by the United States by holding an international exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, mine, forest, and sea in the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri.

"Whereas it is fit and appropriate that the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory be commemorated by an exhibition of the resources of the territory, their development, and of the progress of the civilization therein; and

"Whereas such exhibition should be of a national and international character, so that not only the people of that territory, but of our Union, and of all nations as well, can participate, and should therefore have the sanction of the Congress of the United States: Therefore

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That an exhibit of arts, industries, manufactures, and products of the soil, mine, forest, and sea shall be inaugurated in the year 1903, in the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, as herein provided.

"SEC. 2. That a nonpartisan commission is hereby constituted, to consist of nine commissioners, to be known and designated as the "Louisiana Purchase Exposition Commission," who shall be appointed, within thirty days from the passage of this act, by the President of the United States, and who shall also be subject to removal by him. Vacancies in said commission to be filled in the same manner as original appointments.

"SEC. 3. That the commissioners so appointed shall be called together by the Secretary of State of the United States, in the city of St. Louis, by notice to the commissioners, as soon as convenient after the appointment of said commissioners, and within thirty days thereafter. The said commissioners, at said first meeting, shall organize by the election of their officers, and they may then, or thereafter, appoint such executive or other committees as may

be deemed expedient, and a secretary at a salary of \$3,000 per annum; that in addition to the salary of the secretary of said commission there is hereby allowed, out of any money appropriated to aid in carrying forward said exposition, the sum of \$10,000 per annum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purpose of defraying the clerical, office, and other necessary expenses of said commission.

"SEC. 4. That said commission, when fully organized under the provisions of this act, shall appoint two of their number to act in conjunction with a like number appointed by the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company, to constitute a board of arbitration, to whom all matters of difference arising between said commission and said company, concerning the administration, management, or general supervision of said exposition, including all matters of difference arising out of the power given by this act to the said company or to the said national commission to modify or approve any act of the other of the two bodies shall be referred for determination; and in the case of the failure of said board of arbitration to agree upon such matters as may be so referred, said board of arbitration shall appoint a fifth member thereof; and in case of the failure of the said board to agree upon a fifth member, such fifth member shall then be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury. And the decision of said board shall be final in all matters presented to it for consideration and determination.

"SEC. 5. That said commission be empowered, in its discretion, to accept, for the purposes of the exposition herein authorized, such site as may be selected and offered, and such plans and specifications of buildings for such purpose at the expense of and tendered by the corporation organized under the laws of the State of Missouri, known as 'The Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company.'

"SEC. 6. That the allotment of space for exhibitors, classification of exhibits, plan and scope of the exposition, the appointment of all judges and examiners for the exposition, and the awarding of premiums, if any, shall all be done and performed by the said Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company, subject, however, to the approval of the commission created by section 2 of this act; and said commission is hereby authorized to appoint a board of lady managers of such number and to perform such duties as may be prescribed by said commission, subject, however, to the approval of said company. Said board of lady managers may, in the discretion of said commission and corporation, appoint one member of all committees authorized to award prizes for such exhibits as may have been produced in whole or in part by female labor.

"SEC. 7. That after the plans for said exposition shall be prepared by said company and approved by said commission the rules and regulations of said corporation governing rates for entrance and admission fees, or otherwise affecting the rights, privileges, or interests of the exhibitors, or of the public, shall be fixed or established by said company, subject, however, to the modification or approval of said commission.

"SEC. 8. That said commission shall provide for the dedication of the buildings of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, in said city of St. Louis, not later than the 30th day of April, 1903, with appropriate ceremonies, and thereafter said exposition shall be opened to visitors at such time as may be designated by said company, subject to the approval of said commission, not later than the 1st day of May, 1903, and shall be closed at such time as the national commission may determine, subject to the approval of said company, but not later than the 1st day of December thereafter.

"SEC. 9. That whenever the President of the United States shall be notified by the national commission that provision has been made for grounds and buildings for the uses herein provided for, he shall be authorized to make proclamation of the same, through the Department of State, setting forth the time at which said exposition will be held, and the purpose thereof; and he shall communicate to the diplomatic representatives of foreign nations copies thereof, together with such regulations as may be adopted by the commission, for publication in their respective countries; and he shall, in behalf of the Government and people, invite foreign nations to take part in the said exposition and to appoint representatives thereto.

"SEC. 10. That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the sole purpose of exhibition at said exposition, upon which there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted free of payment of duty, customs fees, or charges, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during the exposition to sell, for delivery at the close thereof, any goods or property imported for and actually on exhibition in the exposition buildings or on the grounds, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when sold or withdrawn for consumption in the United States, shall be subject to the duty, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of importation, and all penalties prescribed by law shall be applied and enforced against such articles and against the person who may be guilty of any illegal sale or withdrawal.

"SEC. 11. That it shall be the duty of the national commission to make reports monthly to the President of the United States, showing receipts and disbursements and giving a general summary of the financial condition of said exposition, and a final report within six months after the close of the exposition, presenting the results and a full exhibit thereof.

"SEC. 12. That the national commission hereby authorized shall cease to exist on the 1st day of January, 1905.

"SEC. 13. That the United States shall not in any manner nor under any circumstances be liable for any of the acts, doings, proceedings, or representations of the said Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company, its officers, agents, or employees, or any of them, or for the service, salaries, labor, or wages of said officers, agents, servants, or employees, or any of them, or for any subscriptions to the capital stock, or for any certificates of stock, bonds, mortgages, or obligations of any kind issued by said corporation, or for any debts, liabilities, or expenses of any kind whatever attending such corporation or accruing by reason of the same.

"SEC. 14. That there shall be exhibited at said exposition by the Government of the United States from its Executive Departments, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Museum, the United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries, and the Department of Labor such articles and material as illustrate the function and administrative faculty of the Government in time of peace and its resources as a war power, tending to demonstrate the nature of our institutions and their adaptation to the wants of the people; and the Bureau of American Republics is hereby invited to make an exhibit illustrating the resources and international relations of the American Republics, and space in the United States Government building shall be provided for the purpose of said exhibit; and to secure a complete and harmonious arrangement of such Government exhibit a board to be known as the United States Government board shall be created, independent of the commission hereinbefore provided, to be charged with the selection, purchase, preparation, transportation, arrangement, installation, safe-keeping, exhibition, and return of such articles and material as the heads of the several Executive Departments, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, the Commissioner of Labor, and the Director of the Bureau of American Republics may, respectively, decide shall be embraced in said Government exhibit.

The President may also designate additional articles for exhibition. Such

board shall be composed of one person to be named by the head of each Executive Department, one by the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and one by the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, one by the Commissioner of Labor, and one by the Director of the Bureau of American Republics. The President shall name one of said persons so detailed as chairman, and the board itself shall appoint its secretary, disbursing officer, and such other officers as it may deem necessary. The members of said board of management, with other officers and employees of the Government who may be detailed to assist them, including officers of the Army and Navy, shall receive no compensation in addition to their regular salaries, but they shall be allowed their actual and necessary traveling expenses, together with a per diem in lieu of subsistence, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, while necessarily absent from their homes engaged upon the business of the board.

Officers of the Army and Navy shall receive their allowance in lieu of the transportation and mileage now allowed by law. Any provision of law which may prohibit the detail of persons in the employ of the United States to other service than that which they customarily perform shall not apply to persons detailed for duty in connection with the said Louisiana Purchase Exposition. Employees of the board not otherwise employed by the Government shall be entitled to such compensation as the board may determine. The disbursing officer shall give bond in the sum of \$30,000 for the faithful performance of his duties, said bond to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury shall advance to said officer from time to time, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, a sum of money from the appropriation hereafter to be made, for the Government exhibit, not exceeding at any one time the penalty of his bond, to enable him to pay the expenses of said exhibit as authorized by the board of management herein created.

"Sec. 15. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to place on exhibition, in connection with the exhibit of his Department, upon such grounds as shall be allotted for the purpose, one of the life-saving stations authorized to be constructed on the coast of the United States by existing law, and to cause the same to be fully equipped with all apparatus, furniture, and appliances now in use in all life-saving stations in the United States.

"Sec. 16. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause a suitable building or buildings to be erected on the site selected for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition for the Government exhibits, as provided in this act, and he is hereby authorized and directed to contract therefor, in the same manner and under the same regulations as for other public buildings of the United States; but the contracts for said building or buildings shall not exceed the sum of \$250,000, which sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to defray the expense of erecting said Government building or buildings hereby authorized. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause the said building or buildings to be constructed from plans to be approved by said Government board; and he is authorized and required to dispose of such building or buildings, or the material composing the same, at the close of the exposition, giving preference to the city of St. Louis or to the said Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company to purchase the same at an appraised value, to be ascertained in such manner as he may determine.

"Sec. 17. That the commissioners appointed by the President under the authority of this act shall receive as compensation for their services and expenses the sum of \$5,000 each per annum, the same to be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury and deducted from any money appropriated for said exposition.

"Sec. 18. That no member of said commission or of said Government board, whether an officer or otherwise, shall be personally liable for any debt or obligation which may be created or incurred by the said commission or by the said United States Government board herein authorized.

"Sec. 19. That whereas the Secretary of the Treasury has certified, under date of February 6, 1901, that the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company has presented to him proof to his satisfaction that it has raised \$10,000,000 for and on account of inaugurating and carrying forward an exposition at the city of St. Louis, Mo., in the year 1903, to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory; therefore, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000,000, to aid in carrying forward such exposition, to pay the salaries of the members and secretary of the national commission herein authorized, and such other necessary expenses as may be incurred by said commission in the discharge of its duties in connection with said exposition; and to discharge all other obligations incurred by the Government on account of said exposition, except for the erection of its own buildings and the making and care of its own exhibits at said exposition.

That the money hereby appropriated shall be disbursed under the direction of the said Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and upon vouchers to be approved by him: *Provided*, That, except for the payment of the salaries and expenses of the national commission, no part of said appropriation shall become available until the sum of \$10,000,000 shall have been expended by said company on account of said exposition to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury; *Provided further*, That all sums expended by the Government on account of said exposition, including the salaries and expenses of said national commission, except for the erection of its own buildings and the making and care of its own exhibits at said exposition, shall be limited to and paid out of the appropriation of \$5,000,000 herein provided for such purpose.

"Sec. 20. That there shall be repaid into the Treasury of the United States the same proportionate amount of the aid given by the United States as shall be repaid to either the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company or the city of St. Louis: *Provided*, That this section shall not be taken or construed to give the United States a right to share in the proceeds of said exposition beyond the actual amount appropriated to aid in carrying forward said exposition.

"Sec. 21. That any bank or trust company located in the city of St. Louis, or State of Missouri, may be designated by the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company to conduct a banking office upon the exposition grounds, and if the bank so designated shall be a national bank, upon such designation being approved by the Comptroller of the Currency, said national bank is hereby authorized to open and conduct such office as a branch of the bank, subject to the same restrictions and having the same rights as the bank to which it belongs: *Provided*, That the branch office authorized hereby, if the same shall be a branch of a national bank, shall not be operated for a period longer than two years, beginning not earlier than July 1, 1902, and closing not later than July 1, 1904.

"Sec. 22. That no citizen of any foreign country shall be held liable for the infringement of any patent granted by the United States, or of any trademark or label registered in the United States, where the act complained of is or shall be performed in connection with the exhibition of any article or thing at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition.

"Sec. 23. That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized, at his discretion, to detail for special duty, in connection with the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, such officers of the Army as may be required, to report to

the general commanding the Department of Missouri; and the officers thus detailed shall not be subject to loss of pay or rank on account of such detail, nor shall any officer or employee of the United States receive additional pay or compensation because of services connected with the said exposition from the United States or from said exposition.

"Sec. 24. That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to create any liability of the United States, direct or indirect, for any debt or obligation incurred, nor for any claim for aid or pecuniary assistance from Congress or the Treasury of the United States in support or liquidation of any debts or obligations created by said commission.

The bill under consideration authorizes the holding of an international exposition, beginning not later than May 1, 1903, at the city of St. Louis, State of Missouri, for the purpose of celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the territory of Louisiana. However much men may have heretofore opposed the holding of national or international expositions under the authority and by the aid of the National Government, there is in this instance, in view of the action of this Congress in the last session, no ground upon which a refusal to authorize the holding of the proposed celebration can be based and the giving of financial aid from the National Treasury for the purpose of carrying the same forward to success can be withheld. In view of this act, and believing that this first great international event in the history of our nation should be appropriately celebrated, this bill is reported to the House for its favorable action.

It will not be denied that the greatest development in science, industry, and civilization in the world's history has taken place in the last half of the century just closed. This marvelous progress in the things essential to the material comfort and happiness of man is not attributable to any single influence. It is nevertheless, an interesting historical fact that the real beginning of this great development is contemporaneous with the first international exposition held in the world. The Crystal Palace, initiated and carried forward by Prince Albert of Great Britain in 1851, marks the beginning of international expositions. In the fifty years that have since intervened the art of exhibiting has grown into a science as exact in its general rules and as far-reaching in its effect on civilization as its antithesis, the science of war. In this fact lies one of the chief reasons for the now strong and constantly growing sentiment in favor of expositions, national and international. In these expositions, states and nations in friendly rivalry exhibit to the world, as neither could otherwise do, the natural resources of their country, their advancement in the arts and sciences, their skill in architecture, the development of their genius in the art of manufacturing, their national characteristics as a people, and generally their advancement in civilization.

These expositions in our day have come to be looked upon as the world's industrial college. As a factor in industrial education, and also in the matter of creating and strengthening friendly relations between the states and nations they are incomparable with any other influence or institution. Their tremendous importance to the state in this respect, and to the world of commerce alone, justifies the expenditure of every dollar of public money given to aid in carrying them forward to success. The general welfare of the people is, through the beneficent influence of these expositions, promoted by the expenditure of public money fully as much if not more than it is by the appropriation of public money for the improvement of alleged rivers and harbors or the expenditure of money for many other alleged public improvements where private interests are chiefly instrumental in securing such appropriations.

But there is another purpose for which many of these expositions are held that should commend them to our favorable consideration. In the life of every nation, and especially during its formative period, there are events that not only mold national character but influence and control national destiny. To appropriately commemorate these is a national duty, to the end that these great events which have contributed most to the influence, power, and greatness of a people as a nation may not fade from memory, but be so impressed upon succeeding generations that love of country will continue to grow in strength as the centuries roll by.

No event in the life of our nation except the achievement of national independence has contributed so much to the peace, happiness, prosperity, power, and commanding influence of the American people as the purchase of the territory of Louisiana. In the evolution of the North American Republic the acquisition of this territory outranks every other event. Since then we have seen that territory with enlightened endeavor, created an empire, greater in area than the territory comprising the original States, into twelve noble democracies, and found the Mississippi River, the original primary object of the purchase, a mighty weapon of power in the preservation of the Union.

We might speculate on what might have been had Thomas Jefferson and his contemporaries allowed this territory to remain in the possession of France or pass to Great Britain, as it would undoubtedly have done but for this purchase. On the day when the treaty of cession was signed Napoleon gave utterance to the following prophetic expression:

"This accession of territory strengthens forever the power of the United States, and I have just given to England a maritime rival that will sooner or later humble her pride."

The fruits of this purchase are too well known to need any recital here to show that the event it is proposed to commemorate is worthy of the grandest celebration of modern times. That an enduring monument to the memory of the statesmen who consummated this purchase should be erected all admit. No more appropriate evidence of our appreciation of their act can be given than by celebrating the first centennial of the purchase of this territory in the metropolis of that imperial domain in the manner proposed, where the people inhabiting this territory will have an opportunity to exhibit to the world the marvelous development and progress of civilization in an unexplored and unknown wilderness during a single century under the inspiration of liberty and the guiding influence of Christianity.

The movement for a celebration of this great first international event had its inception among the people inhabiting the various States and Territories carved out of the vast area acquired in 1803. The movement resulted in a convention of delegates duly appointed by official authority, and representing 15 States and 2 Territories. This convention met in St. Louis on January 10, 1899, to consider the most appropriate way of celebrating and erecting a permanent memorial of this remarkable event in American history. It was unanimously determined to hold an international exposition during the centennial year of this purchase. The city of St. Louis was solicited to inaugurate the enterprise. Notwithstanding the magnitude of the undertaking, the trust was accepted by the patriotic people of that great city, until to-day, through their persevering endeavor, they have raised the sum of \$10,000,000 to aid in carrying forward this great enterprise. The movement to celebrate this great event as proposed has been universally indorsed by the public press, the leading commercial organizations, labor unions, and by State legislatures throughout the country.

The Trans-Mississippi Congress convened at Wichita June 1, 1899, and later at Houston, Tex., April 10, 1900. The National Board of Trade and many State legislatures have passed resolutions pledging support and calling upon Congress to extend the aid of the Federal Government to the success of this movement, to the end that this celebration may be carried on on a scale

commemorate with the progress and wealth of the Republic and the grandeur of the event to be commemorated.

By the terms of an act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, approved June 6, 1900, it was provided that when the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company "shall have raised to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury \$10,000,000 for and on account of inaugurating and carrying forward said exposition at St. Louis, Mo., to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory by the United States, then the United States will authorize the expenditure of a sum of \$5,000,000 for such exposition."

The act referred to also provided the terms and conditions upon which and the purposes for which said sum of \$5,000,000 should be expended. By the action of the present Congress and the Executive, therefore, we are now bound morally, if not legally, to appropriate the sum of \$5,000,000 for the purpose specified, if the Secretary of the Treasury is satisfied that the condition named in the act referred to has been complied with. That this condition has been complied with by the people of the city of St. Louis and that the Secretary of the Treasury is satisfied of that fact is manifest from the following letter addressed to the chairman of your special committee.

TRASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 6, 1901.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to state that there has been submitted to me satisfactory evidence that the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company has raised, by subscription pledges from good and responsible parties, more than \$5,000,000, and by valid ordinance of the city of St. Louis a contribution of \$5,000,000, making in all the sum of \$10,000,000, which has thus been raised available to the exposition company as its needs may require.

Very truly, yours,

L. J. GAGE, Secretary.

Hon. J. A. TAWNEY,

Chairman Committee on the Centennial
of the Louisiana Purchase, House of Representatives.

The people of St. Louis having thus complied with the conditions imposed by Congress, upon the performance of which conditions Congress has promised to aid in carrying forward said exposition to the extent of \$5,000,000, there is now no opportunity for anyone who believes in the Government fulfilling its promises to question the appropriation of the money promised by the sundry civil act.

In addition to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that the people of St. Louis have raised \$10,000,000 for the purpose of carrying forward this exposition, and that this sum has been so raised in advance of making the appropriation by Congress, there is a still further safeguard against any possible loss on the part of the Government. Under the provisions of this bill no part of the money appropriated, except for the salaries of the members and secretary of the commission and the necessities of the commission, can be paid out of this appropriation until the full sum of \$10,000,000 has been expended for and on account of said exposition. It is true that the provision of the sundry civil act referred to does not expressly authorize the holding of an international exposition at St. Louis for the purpose of celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana Territory, but it does so by implication, and, in fact, binds Congress to give express authority for the holding of this exposition.

The bill under consideration therefore first authorizes the inauguration in the year 1903, in the city of St. Louis and State of Missouri, the holding of an exposition at which an exhibit of the arts, industries, manufactures, and products of the soil, mine, forest, and sea shall be inaugurated, and it further provides for the appropriation of the amount promised by Congress in the sundry civil act approved June 6, 1900.

The bill (H. R. 9829) authorizing the holding of this exposition differs only in a few of its provisions from the act, approved April 5, 1890, to provide for celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America by the holding of an exposition at the city of Chicago, State of Illinois.

In considering this bill your committee were fortunate in being able to study its provisions in the light of our experience under the law above referred to. After such study it was deemed necessary to make material changes in the proposed bill to avoid useless expenditure of public money in carrying forward the proposed exposition at St. Louis. Changes were also deemed necessary to obviate many of the difficulties encountered by the national commission and the local corporation under whose joint supervision, administration, and management the World's Columbian Exposition was inaugurated and carried on. These changes were so numerous and the character of them so material that your committee deemed it advisable to prepare and submit the foregoing as a substitute for H. R. 9829.

Section 2 of this substitute reduces the size of the commission from 114 in number to 9, and authority to appoint these 9 commissioners is conferred upon the President, while no authority whatever is given for the appointment of any alternate commissioners, as proposed in section 3 of H. R. 9829. H. R. 9829 provided that the commissioners and alternate commissioners should be entitled to receive, out of the Treasury of the United States, the sum of \$6 per day for subsistence for each day they were necessarily absent from their homes on the business of the commission, besides their actual expenses for transportation.

Upon investigation it was ascertained that the World's Columbian Commission, consisting of the same number as authorized by this bill, received in the aggregate for subsistence and expenses for transportation from the Treasury of the United States the sum of \$497,685. It was also ascertained that because of the great size of the commission it tended rather to interfere with than promote the successful administration and carrying on of the Chicago exposition. In the interest of economy, therefore, and also in the interest of the success of the proposed St. Louis exposition, it was deemed by your committee advisable to reduce the commission to the size mentioned in section 2 of the proposed substitute.

In a communication addressed to the chairman of the special committee under date of May 21, 1900, Hon. Lyman J. Gage, Secretary of the Treasury, who served for some time as president of the board of directors of the corporation known as "The World's Exposition of 1892," written in reply to certain inquiries of the committee, states:

"The commission received generous allowances for subsistence, and the temptation was for frequent meetings and protracted sessions. What might have been expected naturally followed. The meetings of the commission were the center of stormy debate. Few comprehended at all the plan, purpose, and scope of the enterprise. These, perhaps, were the most in evidence. The commission misunderstood the directory and the directory did not understand the commission."

It was also ascertained that frequent and very serious controversies between the commission and the directory of the local corporation occurred, growing out of the conflict of jurisdiction and difference of opinion as to the proper management and administration of the exposition. In the same letter above referred to, Secretary Gage says:

"The situation at times became unbearable to both sides, and after a year or two of working at cross purposes with each other the directory and the commission agreed to respectively delegate their powers to what should be known as a joint board of control, to consist of eight directors and eight

members of the commission. This was a great step forward, but yet the troubles and conflicts did not end. As the enterprise progressed, power was still further concentrated until during the last year or year and a half the joint board of control gave way to what was known as the board of administration, which consisted of two members of the directory and two members of the commission."

In view of this experience, and the anomalous situation of two bodies constituted, one under Federal, the other under State authority, for the control of the same enterprise, your committee deemed it advisable to create a board of arbitration, as provided for in section 4 of the proposed substitute, to whom all matters of difference could be referred for settlement.

Under the provisions of section 6 of H. R. 9829 the national commission is authorized to allot space for exhibitors, prepare a classification of exhibits, determine the plan and scope of the exposition, appoint all judges and examiners, and award all premiums, if any. The Columbian Commission, created by the act of April 25, 1890, was charged with the same duty and possessed the same powers. This entirely relieved the local corporation from the responsibility of this branch of the exposition, from protecting foreign and local exhibitors, and from the payment of the expense incident thereto. It also required the commission to provide for the proper classification and general supervision of all exhibits, and the awarding of all premiums. To accomplish this, the commission, acting under authority of Congress, created what was known as the Government board of control, and in carrying forward and completing the work of this board the Government expended \$303,000.

Believing that this is one of the necessary branches of any exposition of this character, and in all previous instances has been under the control of the local corporation directly responsible for the proper management for all the branches of the exposition, it was deemed advisable to so modify the provisions of this section as to require the Louisiana Purchase Exposition corporation to allot space for exhibitors, classify exhibits, prepare the plan and scope of the exposition, appoint all judges and examiners, and award all premiums, if any, subject, however, to the approval of the national commission, who thereby will have ample opportunity to protect the rights and interests of all foreign exhibitors, as it would clearly be the duty of the Government to do.

It was also found upon investigation that a similar board of lady managers, authorized by section 3 of H. R. 9829, appointed by the World's Columbian Commission, cost the Government in the aggregate for allowances for subsistence, etc., \$39,190. In view of certain other proposed changes in the bill under consideration respecting the payment of salaries, allowances for subsistence, etc., it was deemed advisable to qualify the appointment of a board of lady managers by the commission authorized by this bill by making the number thereof subject to the approval of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company, thereby affording the opportunity to limit the cost of said board of lady managers within the discretion of said company.

An important addition to the section providing the appropriation is the following:

"Provided further, That all sums expended by the Government on account of said exposition, including the salaries and expenses of said national commission, except for the erection of its own buildings and the making and care of its own exhibits at said exposition, shall be limited to and paid out of the appropriation of \$5,000,000 herein provided for such purpose."

Under this provision the various sums paid out by the Government for and on account of the World's Columbian Exposition at Chicago, including the salaries and expenses of the commission, the board of lady managers, and the expenses incurred by the Government board of control, including the expense incident to the making of the final report of the commission, amounting in the aggregate to about \$1,670,000, or over one-third of the total amount which the Government is asked to contribute in aid of the St. Louis exposition, if paid out on account of said exposition, are to be deducted from any money that may be appropriated to carry on the exposition.

A further important and very material provision in the foregoing substitute, one not included in H. R. 9829, will be found in section 30. Under the act of the legislature of the State of Missouri authorizing the people of that State at the last general election to vote upon the question of whether or not the constitution of the State of Missouri shall be so amended as to enable the people of the city of St. Louis to issue bonds in the sum of \$5,000,000 to aid in carrying on the proposed exposition, it was provided that the net proceeds of the exposition shall be divided equally between the stockholders of the company and the city of St. Louis. In view of the financial aid which the Federal Government is asked to contribute to this enterprise, it was deemed only just and fair that, in the event of such aid being given and in the event of there being any net proceeds, the United States should share proportionately with the other contributors to the exposition. Your committee therefore provides:

"SEC. 30. That there shall be repaid into the Treasury of the United States the same proportionate amount of the aid given by the United States as shall be repaid to either the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company or the city of St. Louis: Provided, That this section shall not be taken or construed to give the United States a right to share in the proceeds of said exposition beyond the actual amount appropriated to aid in carrying forward said exposition."

Under the provisions of the foregoing substitute, therefore, it is believed that every interest of the Government in said exposition will be far better protected than under the provisions of H. R. 9829. In the event of favorable action on the part of the House, the adoption of the substitute is respectfully recommended as hereinbefore stated.

For the information of the House the committee hereto append a statement showing the amount heretofore appropriated by Congress in aid of similar expositions, including a detailed statement of the amount appropriated and expended by the Government in aid of the World's Columbian Exposition at Chicago.

Aid or loans to expositions and expenses of Government exhibits.

Centennial Exposition, Philadelphia, 1876 (repaid to United States in 1877)	\$1,500,000.00
Government exhibit	578,500.00
New Orleans Exposition, 1884	1,350,000.00
Government exhibit	300,000.00
Cincinnati Industrial Exposition, 1884: Government exhibit	10,000.00
Louisville Southern Exposition, 1884: Government exhibit	10,000.00
Atlanta Exposition, 1895: Government exhibit and building	200,000.00
Nashville Exposition, 1897: Government exhibit and building	130,000.00
Omaha Trans-Mississippi Exposition, 1898: Government exhibit and building	200,000.00
Philadelphia Exposition of American Products, etc.	350,000.00
Toledo Centennial Exposition	500,000.00
Pan-American Exposition (Buffalo, N. Y.)	500,000.00
Total	5,628,500.00
Appropriations for World's Columbian Exposition	5,381,835.67
Total	11,010,335.67

Appropriations for the World's Columbian Exposition.	
Government buildings:	
Act April 25, 1890.....	\$100,000.00
Act March 3, 1891.....	300,000.00
Expenses World's Columbian Commission:	
Act April 25, 1890.....	200,000.00
Act March 3, 1891.....	50,500.00
Act August 5, 1892.....	120,000.00
Act March 3, 1893.....	118,185.00
	497,685.00
Board of Lady Managers, World's Columbian Commission:	
Act March 3, 1891.....	36,000.00
Act August 5, 1892.....	110,000.00
Act March 3, 1893.....	93,190.00
	239,190.00
Expenses Government board of control, World's Columbian Exposition:	
Act March 3, 1891.....	350,000.00
Act August 5, 1892.....	408,250.00
Act March 3, 1893.....	150,750.00
	909,000.00
World's Congress, World's Columbian Exposition, act March 3, 1891.....	2,500.00
Admission of foreign goods, World's Columbian Exposition:	
Act April 25, 1890.....	20,000.00
Act March 3, 1891.....	20,000.00
	40,000.00
Aid to World's Columbian Exposition, Columbian half dollar, act August 5, 1892.....	2,500,000.00
Loss on recoinage of Columbian half dollar, act August 5, 1892.....	50,000.00
Medals and diplomas, World's Columbian Exposition, acts August 5, 1892, and March 3, 1893.....	103,000.00
Medals and diplomas, World's Columbian Exposition, act February 26, 1896.....	20,600.00
	123,600.00
Distribution of medals and diplomas, resolution of March 13, 1896.....	15,000.00
Expenses committee on awards (reimbursable), World's Columbian Exposition, act March 3, 1893.....	570,880.00
Rent of building, division of awards, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, act February 26, 1896.....	860.00
Acknowledgment to foreign countries for participation in World's Columbian Exposition, act August 18, 1894.....	2,500.00
Synopsis of Department report World's Columbian Exposition: Act August 18, 1894.....	3,500.00
Act July 19, 1897.....	98.45
Compensation to George R. Davis, director-general of World's Columbian Exposition, for final report, act February 26, 1896.....	18,006.10
Reimbursement to Thomas W. Palmer, president of World's Columbian Exposition, for final report, act February 26, 1896.....	1,908.35
Payment to Thomas W. Palmer, president, etc., to pay outstanding claims, deficiency act, June 8, 1896.....	6,517.67
Payment to N. E. Dawson for services rendered World's Columbian Commission, deficiency act, July 19, 1897.....	500.00
Total.....	5,381,835.57

Countervailing Duty on Russian Sugar.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES R. MANN,

OF ILLINOIS.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 21, 1901.

On the bill (H. R. 14236) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year 1901, and for prior years.

Mr. MANN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: So much has been said during the last few days concerning the recent order of the Treasury Department relating to the imposition of a countervailing duty on sugar imported from Russia, and some unjust criticism levied at the able Secretary of the Treasury, that I deem it proper to avail myself of the leave to print to make a full statement of the facts for the benefit of the members of Congress and the country.

DOES RUSSIA PAY A BOUNTY ON THE EXPORT OF SUGAR?

Section 5 of the act of July 24, 1897 (the Dingley Act), provides as follows:

That whenever any country, dependency, or colony shall pay or bestow, directly or indirectly, any bounty or grant upon the exportation of any article or merchandise from such country, dependency, or colony, and such article or merchandise is dutiable under the provisions of this act, then upon the importation of any such article or merchandise into the United States, whether the same shall be imported directly from the country of production or otherwise, and whether such article or merchandise is imported in the same condition as when exported from the country of production, or has been changed in condition by remanufacture or otherwise, there shall be levied and paid, in all such cases, in addition to the duties otherwise imposed by

this act, an additional duty equal to the net amount of such bounty or grant, however the same be paid or bestowed. The net amount of all such bounties or grants shall be from time to time ascertained, determined, and declared by the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall make all needful regulations for the identification of such articles and merchandise and for the assessment and collection of such additional duties.

In pursuance of these provisions, the Secretary of the Treasury, December 12, 1898, directed that additional duties on sugar imported from, or the product of, the following-named countries be collected:

Argentine Republic, Austria-Hungary, Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Russia.

This order, so far as it related to Russian sugar, was in force until April 20, 1900, or a period a little longer than one year and four months. On the day last named the Secretary of the Treasury, at the earnest solicitation of the Department of State, suspended the collection of the countervailing duty on Russian sugar. This action was authorized as a conventional courtesy, and was taken in the belief that no injurious consequences would follow, owing to the fact that little, if any, sugars produced in Russia had found or would find a way to the American market. The temporary suspension of the order of December 12, 1898, offered also an opportunity to review the question, which opportunity was embraced all the more readily in view of the earnest contention of the Russian authorities that no bounty was paid under their laws. It was believed that within sixty or ninety days the negotiations which were being carried on for a reciprocal trade treaty with Russia would be concluded, and the intervening time would offer a fair opportunity for a review of the Secretary's former decision assessing the countervailing duty against Russian sugar. The negotiations referred to were prolonged and finally terminated by abandonment. At first no Russian sugar came to the American market as a result of the suspension of the order assessing the additional duty; but by and by cargoes of such sugar arrived, and within the last few months considerable quantities have been directed toward the American markets.

In reviewing the question as contemplated by the order of suspension, the Treasury Department has endeavored to obtain most accurate information relative to the Russian laws and their operation.

Even the careful and earnest student will find himself in difficulties in an effort to get at the true meaning of the law and the regulations made thereunder. For the benefit of those who may not be able to devote so much time to this task it may be said that the following is regarded as a fair interpretation of the law and the instructions of the Russian Government:

1. The Government establishes the maximum price of refined sugar in the domestic market.
2. Estimating the demand for home consumption, it permits the refiner to put on the market, under a tax of 1.75, a certain limited quantity, well within the known home consumption, but provides that any excess put upon the home market shall be taxed at 3.50, or twice the regular tax (1.75).
3. The interest of the individual refiner, then, lies in putting out all he can at a tax of 1.75 and none under the tax of 3.50.
4. The inevitable result is an excess of stock in the hands of the refiners as a whole, and to get rid of this surplus it is exported. Now, a method exists by which refiner A can get the benefit of the failure of refiner B to supply the home market with his full quota. Home refiner A becomes willing to pay refiner B a certain reward if he will export a portion of his allotted quota and give A the official evidence of such exportation, which enables A to sell in the home market at a tax of 1.75 an equivalent portion of the sugar produced by him (A) in excess of his quota.
5. The maximum prices fixed by the minister of finance are always practically reached by the trade, and are such as to give a very large profit to the producer, particularly in those provinces where, owing to a better economic condition of the population, the demand for sugar exceeds the local supply from the stock entitled to withdrawal for consumption at a single tax. The ability of the producers of sugar in certain regions to obtain higher prices than those obtained in other regions gives rise to the arrangement mentioned in paragraph 4.
6. While it could not be directly inferred from the wording of the statute itself that the Government, in arranging its system of sugar taxation, contemplated an encouragement to export, this object is clearly expressed in the instructions issued in pursuance of the statute by the minister of finance, wherein this arrangement is expressly declared to be made "in order to facilitate the exportation of the surpluses to foreign countries." (Title D, Art. II, secs. 39 and 40.) That it results in a bonus from some source to those who export sugar there can be no doubt.

The Secretary of the Treasury is an administrative officer, and it was primarily his duty, under the statute, to declare whether or not Russia paid a bounty upon the export of sugar within the meaning of section 5 of the act of July 24, 1897. The duty imposed upon him by the statute involves great responsibilities.

Other sugar-producing countries against whom the additional duty has been assessed have not hesitated to urge that Russia also is a bounty-paying country, and that the United States could not afford to favor that country at the expense of others whose sugars were subjected to the heavier burdens. Home producers of sugar, farmers engaged in raising sugar beets throughout the beet-growing sections of the United States, and home refiners of sugar have protested vehemently against the admission of Russian sugar without the assessment of the countervailing duty. On the other hand, manufacturers of iron and steel and machinery of various kinds have quite as urgently demanded that the countervailing duty be not assessed, because of the supposed retaliatory attitude

of Russia with respect to the market for these goods which they enjoyed. But the question to be decided by the Secretary of the Treasury, no matter how much he might sympathize with the beet-sugar growers or with the manufacturers, was, "Does Russia pay a bounty upon the exportation of sugar from that country?"

For quite a while there was much doubt whether an appeal by an importer of sugar from the decision of the Secretary of the Treasury to the Board of General Appraisers would lie. If that officer were to be the sole and final judge in a question of such moment, then his responsibility must be considered as immeasurably greater. That such an appeal does lie was decided by the United States circuit court of appeals February 8, 1901, in the Netherlands sugar bounty case (*Hill Brothers vs. United States*).

In deciding that Russia paid a bounty, Secretary Gage, referring to section 5 of the act of July 24, 1897, said:

The law is not declarative as to who shall determine the fact that a "bounty or grant is paid or bestowed."

In the present case the facts are involved, and the conclusions to be drawn from them are correspondingly difficult. At the conference of delegates on the question of sugar bounties, held in Brussels in June, 1898, the Belgian and Austrian delegates contended that the Russian Government regulations resulted in an indirect bounty on exported sugar equal to the difference between the price (exclusive of excise tax) of sugar sold in that country for home consumption and the price of sugar sold for export.

Russia, on the other hand, protests with great vigor that by no act of hers is any bounty or grant paid or bestowed on the exportation of sugar.

It is represented that Russian sugar is sold for export at prices considerably below the cost of production, and this phenomenon appears to be in some degree due to the regulations of the sugar industry of that country by the Russian Government.

Do the Russian Government regulations have such a bearing upon the facts of the case as to bring Russian sugar within the intent of said law as disclosed by its terms? While the question in its initiative lies with the administration of the Treasury Department, the question is of a judicial rather than of an administrative character, and its importance demands determination by a judicial tribunal. The Board of General Appraisers constitutes such a tribunal, and from its decisions appeal may be taken to the United States courts.

As an administrative officer, it is my duty to determine questions of doubt in favor of the Government, the more so that if I err in that direction the error can be readily corrected by a competent tribunal upon protest and appeal by those adversely affected, while if by my action the interests of the Government are injuriously affected there is no remedy.

In the present case there seems to be no other proper course than the one you are hereby instructed to pursue. It ought to bring the whole question promptly before a body constituted to hear and determine disputed questions of fact and of law.

The jurisdiction of the Board of General Appraisers to determine similar questions has now been sustained by the United States circuit court of appeals in the case of *The United States vs. The Hills Brothers Company*, decided February 8, 1901, unpublished; and if appeal be taken from my ruling to that body, it will be your duty to facilitate in every way a prompt and final adjudication of such appeal.

It is a cardinal principle in the construction of revenue laws that doubtful points should be determined in favor of the Government. If there is doubt that Russia pays a bounty—and it is freely acknowledged by the Secretary that the question is greatly involved—then, under his decision, the importer of Russian sugar has the right of appeal to the Board of General Appraisers. This board, which is composed of nine members selected for their experience and legal ability, is a judicial body. It has a decided advantage over an administrative officer. It can hear witnesses, adduce evidence, and judicially determine questions before it.

From its decisions even there lies an appeal to the United States courts, including the Supreme Court. Now, if the Secretary had decided, as he might have done, that Russia paid no bounty upon the exportation of sugar, the rights of the United States would have been utterly concluded. There would have been no one to appeal from his decision. If he had been in error, as indeed he well might be under such an involved state of law and fact, there would have been no tribunal to correct the mistake. As the case stands there is abundant opportunity for importers to seek a review of the Secretary's decision. If they fail to do so, then their action must be taken to indicate that they acquiesce fully in the Secretary's determination of the case. Their silence could bear no other interpretation. On the other hand, if they appeal as the law provides, the question may receive that full judicial consideration which its importance merits, and doubtless the Secretary of the Treasury would in such event do all he could to facilitate the early consideration of such appeal before the Board of General Appraisers.

Following will be found the translations of the Russian laws and regulations, copies of reports from an American consul, and a translation of extracts from an article entitled "Why is sugar dear?" published at St. Petersburg in *Novoe Vremya*, a Russian daily newspaper, under date of November 9-22, 1900:

THE RUSSIAN LAW.

The following is a translation of the Russian law of November 20, 1895, now in force:

1. The committee of ministers, upon a report of the minister of finance, determines for each sugar campaign:

(a) The total quantity of sugar required for home consumption from all the factories and refineries.

(b) The quantity of sugar to be kept by each factory as an obligatory reserve.

(c) The maximum of prices during the prevalence whereof said reserve must remain intact in the factories, as well as the conditions under which the sugar in reserve can be put on the market.

2. The quantity of sugar produced in excess of the amount fixed for home consumption (as per section 1) is considered as an excess of production, and is subject to an additional tax at the rate of 1 ruble and 75 copecks per pood.

3. The excess (as per section 2) is distributed among the factories in proportion to the quantity of sugar produced by each of them over and above 60,000 poods.

4. The obligatory reserve of sugar to be kept by each factory is derived and completed from the quantity of sugar in excess of the normal quantity (section 2) by taking from such excess the necessary percentage to constitute the prescribed reserve.

5. Sugar in excess of the normal production can not be put on the home market otherwise than upon payment of an additional tax, the normal tax being payable according to the general regulation; however, it is allowed to the manufacturers to keep this excess of sugar as free reserve, and in such case, so long as the sugar does not leave the factory, they are not required to pay either the additional or the regular excise.

6. The sugar in the obligatory reserve is not liable to the payment of tax until it is withdrawn by permission under the conditions indicated in section 7.

7. In cases where the prices in the home market exceed the normal prices fixed the minister of finance authorizes the issuance of sugar from the obligatory reserve and from the free reserve (if necessary) in sufficient quantities to cause a decrease of prices without payment of the additional tax, but with payment of the normal excise.

8. In case of loss, without the fault of the manufacturer, of sugar comprised in the obligatory of the free reserve, the minister of finance is authorized to strike the lost sugar from the factory's accounts, without exacting the excise and additional tax charged against it.

9. Upon the exportation from factories of the excess of sugar, the same is exempted from excise and additional tax in full measure.

NOTE.—In case of such a rise of the prices of sugar in the foreign European markets, as might become an encouragement of a considerable overproduction by sugar factories in the Empire, the minister of finance is authorized to submit to the committee of ministers a recommendation for the reduction or a total suspension for a given period of time, of the exemption of the exported sugar from the additional tax.

10. The delivery of sugar from factories and beet-sugar refineries is allowed only upon permits of the excise supervisor who certifies by his signature upon the transit document to the regularity of the delivery.

11. Persons guilty of an unauthorized delivery from factories of sugar pertaining to the obligatory reserve, or of the delivery of surplus sugar without payment of additional tax, as well as refiners and traders guilty of knowingly acquiring such irregularly delivered sugar, are liable to the penalties provided by section 1000 of the excise law, edition of 1893.

12. The minister of finance is authorized, with the concurrence of the comptroller of the Empire, to establish the proper accountability of the factories for the additional tax on sugar produced in excess to determine the method of apportioning such excess among the factories, of forming the obligatory reserves, of keeping and releasing the same, and also exporting the surplus and to give all necessary directions and explanations concerning the application of the present law.

The following is a translation of the regulations made by the Russian Government in furtherance of the law above quoted, and is taken from the *Vestnik Finansov*, 1896:

Instructions as to the manner of carrying into effect the opinion of the State council, most graciously approved on the 20th November, 1895, relative to certain measures concerning the sugar industry.

[Approved by the minister of finance on December 23, 1895, in accordance with section 3, note 1, and section 4, note —, and section 1, opinion of State council, most graciously approved November 20, 1895.]

A. ON THE ACCOUNTING FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE SUGAR SURPLUSES AMONG THE FACTORIES.

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

SECTION 1. For the purpose of apportioning among the sand-sugar factories and beet-sugar refineries (including the Zhityn refinery) the sugar surpluses subject to an additional tax, pursuant to the act of November 20, 1895, the ministry of finance shall prepare a preliminary and a final account, together with a supplemental account.

SEC. 2. Preliminary accounts are prepared (a) toward the beginning of the sugar campaign and (b) upon receipt of returns on the production of the mills, furnished in the manner hereinafter indicated, in the month of October.

The final account is made after the termination of the production of juice in the majority of the mills, and the account supplemental thereto, upon the receipt of returns, in the month of April, in regard to such mills as may not have completed their operations toward the month of January.

SEC. 3. The preliminary account ascertains the maximum expected total production of sugar at the mills. The final account, together with the account supplemental thereto, ascertains the actual total production of sugar.

After thus ascertaining the total production of sugar, the percentage ratio is determined which the surplus shall bear to the excess of the production of the several mills over and above the 60,000 poods allowed to each of them and the portion of the surplus is fixed which is to be set apart as an indivisible reserve at the mills.

SEC. 4. Inasmuch as the percentage of surplus determined by the accounts mentioned will naturally vary, so must accordingly vary the apportionment of the surplus production among the several mills.

II. THE EXCISE BOARDS TO PREPARE AND SUBMIT REPORTS WHEREON THE ACCOUNTING IN REGARD TO THE SUGAR SURPLUSES IS TO BE MADE.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of drawing up the first preliminary account the excise boards are directed to present to the department of non-assessable taxes, on or before August 15 next preceding any given sugar campaign, returns upon the following subjects: (a) number of mills and refineries which are to be in operation during the coming sugar campaign; (b) quantity of sugar on hand in each credited to the indivisible reserve stock; (c) quantity of free surplus sugar carried over from the preceding campaign and canceled off the surplus account; (d) number of dessinations of land under beets planted by the mill owners themselves and by planters; (e) quantity and quality of the expected beet crop, estimated upon the average beet crops of the three years previous and the quantity planted in the current year; and (f) quantity of the expected output of sugar.

These returns are to be presented in schedule form (Form *littera a*), and apart from it by telegram wherein shall only be stated: "Transferred to production, 00 poods; total output of sugar expected, 00 poods; mills to be in operation, 00."

NOTE.—In making returns under this section, as well as those hereinafter mentioned, an account shall be made which shall be signed by the comptroller and by the management of the mill.

SEC. 6. For the second preliminary accounting the excise boards are directed to present to the department of non-assessable taxes on or before October 25, the following returns in relation to the mills up to October 20: (a) Number of factories producing juice, specifying the number among them

with an ascertained productive capacity of not over 60,000 poods; (b) actual quantity of sugar transferred from the free surplus of the previous campaign to the production of the current campaign; (v) quantity of beet harvested, specifying, for proper future consideration, the quantity of beet delivered to the factories as well as that remaining on the fields, whether merely not carried off or left in the ground, and showing the causes which have delayed the delivery of the beet to the factories; (g) average quality of the normal juice of the same, as proven by polarimetric test, indicating also its technical value, and (d) upon all these data, the estimated quantity of sugar about to be produced.

Said returns shall be presented in the annexed schedule form (Form *littera* b), and apart from it, by telegram, wherein shall merely be stated: "Mills in operation, 00, of which 00, with a capacity not exceeding 60,000 poods; transferred to production of sugar, 00 poods; yield of beet, 00 berkovetz; quality of juice 'bricks,' 00; quality of sugar, 00; grade, 00; technical value, 00; estimated production expected, 00 poods."

SEC. 7. For the purpose of final accounting, the excise boards are directed to present to the department of nonassessable taxes, on or before the 15th January, the following returns for the period ending January 1:

As to sand-sugar factories wherein the production of juice has been completed: (a) quantity of sugar, strictly all white, registered and carried over from the free surplus of the period last past; (b) quantity of sugar, white, half white, and yellow of the II and III crystallizations, registered since the beginning of the campaign, the quantity of half-white and yellow sugars to be reduced to white sugar; (v) quantity of white sugar as yet unregistered; (g) quantities on hand of unregistered white sugar and yellow sugar of the II and III crystallizations produced during the current campaign, but not wrought over as yet into white sugar; also quantity of molasses drained from the II and III crystallizations; and (d) upon all the foregoing data the estimated total output of sugar at the mills for the period under consideration, stating the exact number of factories with an output not exceeding 60,000 poods each, as well as their aggregate production.

In computing the total production of white sugar at a factory no other unfinished products may be considered but those hereinafter mentioned, the same to be reckoned as white sugar at the following rates: Half white, equal 92 per cent white; yellow sugar, II crystallization, equal 75 per cent; yellow sugar, III crystallization, equal 50 per cent; molasses, from II crystallization, equal 25 per cent, and molasses, III crystallization, equal 10 per cent. These returns shall be presented in schedule form, as per specimen hereto annexed (form, *littera* v). Apart from this, the excise boards shall wire to the Department a statement in form following: "Production of juice completed at — factories; total production of white sugar, estimated at — poods, including the product of — factories with an output not exceeding 60,000 poods each, estimated in all at — poods."

As to beet-sugar refineries, wherein there should at the time still remain on hand a large variety of products of refining in process of manufacture, the following course shall be pursued in relation to the returns to be presented on the 15th of January: The management of every mill shall furnish to the local excise office, on or before January 5, detailed schedules specifying (a) the quantity of registered sugar transferred from the surplus of the free reserve of the previous campaign into the production of the current campaign; (b) quantity of sugar weighed and registered since the beginning of the campaign; (v) quantity of white sugar finished, but as yet unregistered, and (g) stock on hand of beet-sugar refining products in all stages of manufacture, beginning with refined sugar treated for whitening, as well as in the process of drying, every item of drains to be followed by the quantity of white sugar contained therein.

The local excise officers in charge shall compare the statements in the schedules furnished by the management with actual facts and deduct from the stated total of white sugar in process of manufacture the quantity, pood for pood, of purchased white sand sugar operated upon (purchased sand sugar in general is not taken into account). Detailed returns, specifying the production of the mills above mentioned, are to be presented by the excise boards to the department of nonassessable taxes in schedule form (form *littera* g) simultaneously with the returns concerning sand-sugar factories wherein the production of juice has been completed. Apart from it each excise board shall wire a statement as follows: "Beet sugar refineries, —; production, preliminary estimate, — poods."

Said returns are accepted provisionally for the January accounting subject to correction, to be made upon the receipt of the returns on the production of beet-sugar refineries up to April 1, which are to be presented by the excise boards to the department of nonassessable taxes on or before April 15. The production of such refineries up to said date is determined upon the same data and at the same rates as those hereinabove set forth in reference to beet-sugar factories for the term ending January 1, with the following modifications and exemptions, however: The output is computed by the excise authorities (a) upon the quantities of refined sugar weighed and registered, of white, half-white, and yellow sugars, respectively, reducing half-white and yellow sugars to white sugar, at the rates set forth in this section, after eliminating from the total, pood for pood, the quantity of purchased white-sand sugar previously registered at other mills; (b) upon the quantity of registered white sugar transferred from the surplus of free reserve of the previous campaign into the production of the current campaign; (v) upon the remaining stocks of unregistered refined sugar and white sugars, and of unfinished half-white sugar and yellow sugar of the II crystallization, putting the white-sugar contents of half-white sugar at 92 per cent and those of yellow sugar of the II crystallization at 75 per cent.

To the quantity, so computed, of white sugar and other sugars reduced to white sugar, an allowance of 8 per cent on the total is added to account for the white sugar remaining in other products of refining, beginning with molasses drained from the II crystallization and yellow sugar of the III crystallization; the total of white sugar thus computed is finally taken as the output of the refinery for the period under consideration. Final returns concerning beet sugar refineries, to be used in the supplemental accounting, are to be presented to the department of nonassessable taxes, pursuant to the annexed schedule form (Form *littera* e), on or before April 15. Apart from this the following shall be stated by telegram: "Output of beet-sugar refineries estimated as 00 poods."

As to sand-sugar mills wherein the production of juice may not have been completed by January 1, the output of sugar is determined in conformity with the rules established for beet-sugar refineries, to wit: The managements of the mills must present to the excise office, on or before January 5, a detailed schedule, to be audited by the local excise officers, stating (a) quantity of surplus of last campaign, in the shape of registered white sugar, transferred from the free reserve into the production of the current campaign; (b) quantity of white, half white, and yellow sugars, weighed and registered, half white and yellow sugars being reduced to white sugar at the percentage rates set forth in this section; (v) stock on hand of products in all stages of manufacture, setting forth against each item of drains its white sugar contents, and, lastly, (g) quantity of beet unworked, and yield of sugar expected therefrom. Detailed returns specifying the production of the mills herein mentioned are to be presented in the annexed schedule form (Form, *littera* d), by the excise boards to the department of nonassessable taxes simultaneously with the returns on such factories as have completed the production of juice.

Apart from this the following shall be stated by telegram: "00 factories

have not completed production of juice, their output estimated for the time being at 00 poods." These returns are accepted, provisionally, for the January accounting, pending correction to be made upon receipt, by the department of nonassessable taxes of the returns of the several excise boards on said factories for the period ending April 1.

Said returns are made in the regular order provided for beet-sugar factories wherein the production of juice has been completed, and must be presented to the department on or before April 15.

Apart from this the following shall be stated by telegram: "Production of the backward sand sugar factories, estimated at 00 poods."

SEC. 8. Should the main sugar refining operations at any beet-sugar refineries for any reason remain unfinished toward April 1, final returns for this additional term must nevertheless be made without fail, in which case work at the mills must be temporarily suspended as far as necessary for such purpose.

SEC. 9. All information requisite for determining thereon the production of the several mills, whenever the same can not be obtained from the fiscal books kept at said mills, must be furnished to the excise officers by the managements thereof; and in case the accuracy of the information so furnished be questioned, it is for the management to substantiate the same by producing to the excise officers the books of account and such commercial, chemical, or other books as are kept at the mill, as well as any agreements, contracts, business documents, and the like, such as there may be.

SEC. 10. All products of sugar manufacture are taken by the excise officers at the actual quantity thereof on hand at the mills at the time. The quantity of the products is determined by weight or geometrical measurement.

III. DRAWING THE ACCOUNTS OF THE SUGAR SURPLUSES AND APPLYING SAID ACCOUNTS TO THE SEVERAL MILLS.

SEC. 11. Upon the returns above set forth the department of nonassessable taxes ascertains the aggregate production of sugar at all the factories. The production of the Zhityn molasses refinery is estimated upon the yields of refined sugar won from molasses at said refinery within the three campaigns last preceding.

SEC. 12. According to the aggregate production of sugar ascertained as above set forth, the ministry of finance determines what percentage ratio the surplus shall bear to the output in excess of 60,000 poods, and fixes the portion of the surplus to be set apart for the indivisible reserve, of which it thereupon advises the excise boards, and through them the sugar manufacturers.

SEC. 13. Upon the two preliminary accounts the distribution of the surplus (to wit, into the indivisible reserve and the free surplus) proceeds apace with the registration of the sugar. So, at a mill with an output exceeding 60,000 poods, should there be 50 per cent appropriated for the surplus, of which 10 per cent for the indivisible reserve, then, after allowing the first 60,000 poods, 10 per cent of any quantity of sugar which is being registered must be set apart for the indivisible reserve, 40 per cent into the free reserve, and 50 per cent (over and above the 60,000 poods) may be shipped by the owner from the mill, free, without the payment of an additional tax.

SEC. 14. In making the final account at the sand-sugar factories the output thereof is directly determined upon the returns presented in January, and the surplus is apportioned accordingly. For example, if from the products taken into account in preparing the January report the output of a mill has been ascertained to amount to 160,000 poods and the surplus has been fixed at 50 per cent, of which 10 per cent for the indivisible reserve, then the mill owner may ship free 110,000 poods (60+50=110 thousand poods), 10,000 poods must next be set aside for the indivisible reserve, and all the remaining quantity of sugar is counted as free surplus.

SEC. 15. With regard to those beet-sugar refineries and sand-sugar factories, wherein the production of juice is not completed by January and a final account can not be drawn, the distribution of the surplus proceeds as fast as the sugar is being registered, up to the supplemental (April) accounting; after said accounting is made said mills are proceeded with as hereinabove in the foregoing section set forth.

NOTE.—In the Zhityn molasses refinery the distribution of the surplus proceeds with the registration of sugar in the course of the entire campaign, provided that at said mill that quantity only of sugar is to be taken into account at which its output may from time to time be estimated; so, if the output of the Zhityn mill, for a given campaign, be estimated at 270,000 poods, and 50 per cent be ordered to be set apart for the surplus, then there may be shipped from the mill, free, i. e., without payment of the additional tax, no more than 165,000 poods (60,000 105,000+105,000 poods).

SEC. 16. In beet-sugar refineries, as well as in the Zhityn mill, purchased sand sugar and refined sugar won therefrom (allowing pood for pood) are generally considered free for shipment and are not taken into account in calculating the surplus. For example, if at a refinery with an output of 225,000 poods there be 100,000 poods of purchased sand, only 125,000 poods are considered in calculating the surplus.

SEC. 17. Upon every accounting, where a new percentage is fixed, a redistribution of the surplus at the several mills is to be made, computing from the beginning of the campaign. For example, if, upon the first preliminary accounting, there was set apart for the surplus 50 per cent, and upon the second 40 per cent, then, in accordance with the latter calculation, one fifth part of the surplus previously set apart is transferred to the free-sugar account.

B. ON THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE SURPLUS SUGAR AMONG THE SEVERAL MILLS AND ON CHARGING THE SAME WITH EXCISE AND ADDITIONAL TAX.

SEC. 13. Upon every accounting made by the ministry of finance for the apportionment of the surplus a memorandum is to be made at the mill by the excise officers in charge, in the presence of representatives of the mill management, which memorandum shall be in triplicate, one copy to remain on file with the books and the other copies to be returned, respectively, to the district and the provincial excise board.

In the memorandum made upon the first preliminary accounting shall be entered (a) the percentage fixed for the distribution of the surplus; (b) the indivisible reserve on hand at the mill, and (c) the quantity of the free surplus of sugar carried over from the previous campaign without being canceled off the surplus account.

In the memorandum made upon the second preliminary accounting (as well as upon the third accounting with regard to such beet-sugar refineries and sand-sugar factories as may not have completed the production of juice by January) shall be entered in addition thereto the result of the redistribution, under the modified percentage rates, of the sugar previously registered, into free sugar and surplus.

In the memorandum made upon the final accounting shall be entered (a) the total output of the mill, ascertained in the course of the preparation of the returns; (b) the distribution of this quantity, in accordance with the latest percentages fixed, into free sugar (not subject to the additional tax) and surplus; (c) the indivisible reserve on hand at the mill; (g) the quantity of the free surplus of sugar carried over from the previous campaign, and (d) the stock of sugar remaining at the mill at the time the memorandum is made, specifying in what products said stock is kept at the mill. Memoranda upon the supplemental (April) account are made in the same manner.

SEC. 19. If a millowner should want the free surplus of sugar left at the mill toward the end of the campaign to be canceled off the surplus account and transferred to the sugar production of the coming campaign, he must file with the excise board, on or before August 1, a special declaration to that effect, upon which the excise officers in charge shall, on September 1, duly enter in the books of the closed and the coming campaign the cancellation of such surplus and the transfer thereof to the production of the new campaign.

If no such declaration be filed in due time by the mill owner, all the remaining surplus of the free reserve shall on September 1 be canceled by the excise officers from the surplus account of the past campaign and transferred to the free surplus accumulating through the current campaign.

NOTE.—The surplus carried over from the previous campaign without being transferred to the coming production is not included in the production account in making the accounts for the several mills, as set forth in sections 5 to 7.

SEC. 20. The surplus sugar is charged with the excise and the additional tax as fast as said surplus is registered at the mill. Until the surplus (of the indivertible as well as of the free reserve) is removed from the mill, however, neither the excise nor the additional tax is levied thereon.

NOTE 1.—All products of sugar manufacture, which under the rules in force are free from excise, are in general exempt from the additional tax, and may be removed from the mill free.

NOTE 2.—In accounting with the mills for the excise, pursuant to section 89, excise tax law, the excise due for the registered surplus left over at the mill is deducted from the total sum of excise due from the mill, and of the balance so obtained one-third is made payable on June 1 and two-thirds on September 1.

SEC. 21. There should be kept at the mill an account book, fastened and sealed by the board of control, for the additional tax charged on registered sugar, after the form hereto annexed (Form, littera). (1) Until said books are received from the board of control there are to be kept at the mills provisional books, after the same form, fastened and sealed by the excise boards.

NOTE.—Mills with an output not exceeding 60,000 poods are not required to keep such a book.

SEC. 22. Apart from the book described in the foregoing section, there shall be kept by the excise officers in charge at every mill a memorandum, fastened and sealed by the excise board and in form prescribed by the latter, wherein shall be entered, after the final accounting, the stock on hand, expenditure and balance (a) of free sugar, (b) of the indivertible reserve, (c) of the free surplus, and (d) of the surplus carried over from the previous campaign, specifying the products wherein all said sugar is kept.

SEC. 23. The mill managements are required to file with the local sugar excise board, not later than on the 10th day of every month, a copy of the said account book for the month previous.

The excise boards must keep special books, in form prescribed by the superintendents of excise taxes, to account for the additional sugar tax as well as for surplus sugar.

SEC. 24. Whenever, in case of a rise of the sugar prices beyond the fixed limit, the minister of finance permits part of the inadivertible reserve, or of the surplus held in the free reserve, to be put free on the domestic market, such surplus sugar is, in due quantity, to be canceled off the surplus account and transferred to the free-sugar account; if the said surplus sugar has previously been registered, it is accordingly subject to the payment of the excise tax, alike with the sugar of the current campaign, although it may not have been virtually removed from the mill.

V. ON THE ACCUMULATION OF AN INDIVERTIBLE SUGAR RESERVE AND THE SAFE-KEEPING THEREOF AT THE MILLS.

SEC. 25. The indivertible sugar reserve at the mills is formed by setting apart for the same a fixed portion of the sugar surplus as above set forth. There shall be set apart for the indivertible reserve, generally, white sugar (sand or refined). Should it be impossible to fill the indivertible reserve with white sugar, by reason of the absence thereof, other products shall be set apart for said reserve, the quantity thereof to be reduced to white sugar.

SEC. 26. Sugar of the indivertible reserve must be kept at the mill apart from other sugar, and invariably in such a manner as to make the stock on hand of the reserve easily ascertainable at all times by the excise officers in charge.

NOTE.—Where the keeping of the reserve sugar at the mill may, through lack of room, cause much inconvenience, the excise office may authorize the safe-keeping of such sugar at the owner's warehouses, located without the mill yard, such sugar to be charged by a lien and a memorandum to be made thereof, provided that such warehouses are not far distant from the mill, or are generally capable of sufficient supervision by the excise officers of the district wherein the mill itself is located, and further provided, that in case it be necessary to establish special supervision or a special guard over such stores or warehouses, all expenses which may be incurred for such purpose be chargeable to the owner. In transporting reserve sugar from the mills to the warehouses above mentioned security must be given, while in transit, for the excise due thereon, at the rate of 75 kopecks per pood, as well as for the additional tax, at the rate of Rb. 1.75 per pood; if, however, the transportation proceeds under the supervision of the excise office, no security is required.

SEC. 27. Sugar of the indivertible reserve which is carried over from the previous campaign must be replaced, without fail, with white sugar from the first returns of the new campaign. In the course of the campaign the stock of sugar of the indivertible reserve may, by leave of the proper excise authority, be replaced with other sugar (none other, however, than white) in like quantity.

SEC. 28. In case registered white sugar kept as an indivertible reserve or left over from the indivertible reserve, be injured by dampness or other cause, it may, each time by special leave of the superintendent of excise taxes, be dried at the mill, and the registered wrappers may be removed therefrom without again being charged with excise. To obtain leave to dry the sugar, the management of the mill must present a petition to that effect through the local inspector of sugar-excise taxes. The superintendent of sugar-excise taxes, in granting the petition, designates, in the permit for drying the sugar, the term within which the drying is authorized and the time within which the sugar after drying must be again packed in its former wrappers, each wrapper to contain the same quantity and bear the same number as previously entered in the book of the mill. Sugar which is permitted to be dried must be removed from storage, as well as returned, weighed, and packed into its former wrappers by the management of the mill in the presence of the proper excise officers, of which a memorandum must be made in triplicate, to be filed with the records of the mill, of the provincial, and the district board, respectively.

SEC. 29. Sugar of the free reserve, if the same has been registered, must be kept in such a manner as to be at all times easily capable of examination by the proper excise officers.

SEC. 30. Sugar of the indivertible reserve in stock at the mill is accepted as security for the 75-kopeck portion of the excise on any sugar removed from the mill, at the following prices until further order: (a) White sand at the rate of 1 ruble per pood, and (b) refined sugar at the rate of 1.25 rubles per pood.

White sand and refined sugar of the free reserve are accepted at the same rates as security for the 75-kopeck portion of the excise, as well as for the additional tax.

NOTE.—Free sugar (exempt from the additional tax) is accepted until further order as security for the 75-kopeck portion of the excise, as well as the additional tax, (a) white sand at the rate of 1.75 rubles, and (c) refined sugar at the rate of 1.25 rubles per pood.

G. ON THE SHIPMENT OF SURPLUS SUGAR FROM THE MILL TO THE DOMESTIC MARKET.

SEC. 31. No sugar of any category (free sugar or indivertible or free reserve) may be removed from the mill unless by leave of the excise office.

SEC. 32. Sugar of the indivertible reserve, as well as sugar of the free reserve, may be shipped from the mills without payment of the additional tax only by special permission of the ministry of finance, in case of a rise in the prices of sugar beyond the fixed limit.

SEC. 33. Except in the case mentioned in the foregoing section, the removal of sugar from the indivertible reserve is not permitted at all, and sugar of the free surplus (free reserve) may be shipped only after the additional tax due thereon has been fully paid into the treasury, for which a receipt of the treasury must be produced by the mill management. (The 75-kopeck portion may be paid or secured in the regular order.)

SEC. 34. The comptroller of the mill, being satisfied that the intended shipment of sugar is regular, and, in case the free surplus is to be shipped, that the additional tax has first been paid thereon, permits the shipment of sugar by proper indorsement on the bill of lading, as well as on the stub, describing the category of the sugar, shipped as "free," "from the free reserve," or "from the indivertible reserve." In addition to the indorsement the official seal of the comptroller must be affixed to the bill of lading.

SEC. 35. When paying into the treasury the additional tax on the surplus sugar the mill management must state, in the declaration presented to the treasury, that the money is remitted in payment of "the additional sugar tax."

SEC. 36. The Treasury must note, in the receipts issued for the payment of the additional tax, that the money has been remitted in payment of "the additional sugar tax." In the schedules of excise revenue presented by the internal-revenue officers to the department of nonassessable taxes, must be specified the receipts of the additional tax, under section 6, Article I, (excise on sugar) as a special item b.

D. ON THE EXPORTATION OF SUGAR SURPLUSES FROM THE MILLS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND ON THE CESSION OF FREE SUGAR FROM ONE MILL TO ANOTHER, IN ORDER TO FACILITATE SUCH EXPORTATION.

1. ON THE MANNER OF EXPORTING SUGAR TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

SEC. 37. Free sugar, exempt from the additional tax, may be exported to foreign countries in compliance with the rules heretofore existing; the exportation of such sugar requires, however, a permit from the excise office, which must be duly indorsed on the bill of lading, as set forth in sections 31 and 34 of these instructions.

NOTE.—The mill owner is allowed to export free sugar (this rule does not apply to purchased sand or refined sugar produced from purchased sands) on account of his surplus for the same campaign. For this purpose the export is made in the manner hereinafter, in subdivisions 1 to 4 of section 38, set forth, except that the excise office notes on the certificate "free from sugar," and requires no security for the additional tax. Upon the return of the certificate with the custom-house export mark, the excise office credits the exported quantity of sugar to the free surplus of the mill, if such there be, and increases by a like quantity the allowance of free sugar, of which a memorandum and an entry in the book must be made.

SEC. 38. In relation to exports of the free surplus (free reserve) of sugar from the mills, the following special order must be observed, in addition to the rules now in force.

(1) The transport of sugar from the free reserves intended for export to foreign countries, must be shipped in the presence of the excise authorities, who, after examining the transport, indorse on the bill of lading accompanying the same that said sugar has been removed from the free reserve for exportation abroad, and issue a separate certificate to the mill owner, setting forth the name of the mill, the bill of lading accompanying the transportation, and the statement of the weight of the sugar contained therein.

(2) The additional tax, at the rate of rubles 1.75 per pood, chargeable to the exported sugar, must first be secured in full by cash, excise credit vouchers, or such funds as are accepted as security for the tobacco excise, or by the stock of sugar, free or of the free reserve, on hand in the factory, as set forth in section 30 of these instructions. (The 75-kopeck portion of the excise due on the exported sugar is to be paid or secured in accordance with the rules now in force.)

(3) The custom-house duly examines the exported shipment of the free surplus, the tare previously certified by the excise office being accepted at its actual weight as per bill of lading annexed to the export certificate. After forwarding the transport across the border, the custom-house delivers to the shipper, in lieu of refunding the excise (not the additional tax, however), a voucher crediting the same on his sugar excise account and marks down by indorsement on the certificate of the excise office presented by him (subdivision 1) the time of export, the net weight of the exported sugar, and the credit voucher issued stating the amount of excise allowed.

(4) The certificate with the indorsement of the custom-house must be returned by the mill owner to the excise office within six months from the date the sugar was shipped from the mill, whereupon the additional tax charged upon the exported sugar is remitted by the excise office, by a corresponding credit in proportion to the quantity of sugar exported, and the deposits securing the same are released. If the certificate is not returned within said time, or does not account for the full quantity of sugar which was to have been exported, then, upon the failure of the mill owner to pay within two weeks the additional tax due, the excise office must proceed with the collection thereof in regular manner.

(5) The mill owner may forward his surplus sugar through the excise office, conformably to the rules of 7th December, 1887, laid down for the export of spirits to foreign countries without security. In such case the sugar is accepted by the railroad in the presence of an excise officer or comptroller. The railroad bill of lading must be addressed to the custom-house through which the sugar is about to be exported, and the duplicate of the railroad bill of lading is delivered to the excise officer by whom it was forwarded, together with the certificate authorizing the removal of the sugar from the mill (subd. 1) to the same custom-house, whereupon the deposits securing the additional tax are released. Upon the arrival of the freight at the point of destination the custom-house accepts the same in the presence of the shipper and forwards it across the frontier as above directed, at the same time delivering it to the shipper in lieu of refunding the excise, a credit voucher, and thereupon returns the certificates of the excise office, with proper indorsement, to the excise board, which orders the additional tax to be remitted or in case of a shortage of sugar to be collected, as in the manner set forth in the foregoing section.

(6) Yellow sugar of any kind forming part of the free surplus may be exported to foreign countries in accordance with the rules of November 13, 1886, in relation to the manner of exporting yellow sand sugars to foreign

countries. The additional tax is secured in the manner above set forth (and the 75-kopec portion of the excise in the manner set forth in the circular of the ministry of finance under date of September 3, 1894, being No. 2412). The memorandum made by the excise officer in charge on removal of said sugar from the mill takes the place of the certificate above mentioned (sub-division 1), upon receipt of which memorandum, with the custom-house export mark thereon, the additional tax is remitted and the deposits securing the additional tax are returned.

II. ON TRANSFERS OF FREE SUGAR FROM ONE MILL TO ANOTHER IN ORDER TO FACILITATE THE EXPORTATION OF THE SURPLUSES TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

SEC. 39. A manufacturer may cede to another manufacturer his right to place on the home market free—i. e., without the payment of an additional tax—his allotted quota of sugar.

SEC. 40. In relation to such cession the following rules may be observed.

(1) The manufacturer who assigns to another manufacturer his right to dispose of a certain quantity of sugar free must give notice thereof to the local excise board, which first orders to hold at the mill a quantity of free sugar equal to that about to be assigned, and immediately thereupon duly communicates with the excise board having jurisdiction of the mill in whose favor the assignment is being made.

(2) If the assignment is accepted by the latter mill, the quantity of free sugar in said mill is correspondingly increased by transfer from the free surplus (not from the indivisible reserve), of which a memorandum is made by the excise officers in charge; thereupon the excise board, from which the communication in relation to the assignment of free sugar has been received, is notified of the acceptance of said assignment.

(3) Upon receipt of the notification that the assignment has actually been accepted, the quantity of free sugar at the factory by which the assignment has been made is correspondingly reduced by transferring the same into the free surplus (or free reserve), of which a memorandum is made by the excise officers in charge.

(4) The reduction of the quantity of free sugar at one mill and the increase thereof, by assignment, at another mill are entered in the proper books of the mill.

(The books referred to are those which are required by the instructions and subject at all times to inspection by the excise officer. Secs. 21 and 22, form 1+.)

Sections 42 and 41 regulate "the allowances to be made for sugar exported prior to the enactment of measures for the regulation of the sugar industry," viz, prior to 1895-96, and have no further application to-day.

REPORTS FROM AN AMERICAN CONSUL.

Referring to instructions from the Department dated July 24, 1900, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury under date of July 13, 1900, in which the honorable Secretary requests that certain information be obtained by consular officers in Russia in relation to beet-root sugar. The information asked for is designated under four different headings, and I have endeavored to answer the same in the order in which they appear in the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury. I have also, as instructed by the Department, reported on other points that may be of interest in connection with this question.

The Secretary of the Treasury desired information in regard to the following particulars:

(1) "The prices of Russian sugar for export during the period of time between September 1, 1899, and June 30, 1900."

These prices were as follows:

Date.	Price per pood.
	Rubles.
September, 1899	1.25
October, 1899	1.23 to 1.25
November, 1899	1.27 to 1.28½
December, 1899	1.27½ to 1.31
January, 1900	1.29 to 1.25
February, 1900	1.27½ to 1.31
March, 1900	1.31 to 1.38½
April, 1900	1.35 to 1.41
May, 1900	1.38½ to 1.46
June, 1900	1.50

These prices are for the white sand sugar at the station of the Southwestern Railway.

(2) "The prices of sugar for home consumption, exclusive of excise tax, during the same period of time."

These prices were as follows:

Date.	Price per pood.
	Rubles.
September, 1899	2.55 to 2.60
October, 1899	2.45 to 2.50
November, 1899	2.45 to 2.52½
December, 1899	2.45 to 2.47½
January, 1900	2.42 to 2.50
February, 1900	2.45 to 2.65
March, 1900	2.60 to 2.72½
April, 1900	2.70 to 2.75
May, 1900	2.68½ to 2.81
June, 1900	2.75 to 2.82½

These prices are for white sand sugar at the stations of the Southwestern Railway.

(3) "The cost of production of each of the several kinds of sugar produced for foreign and home markets."

The diverse conditions of soil and climate in the regions in which beet root is cultivated in Russia engenders considerable difference in the beet-root crop as regards quantity and quality. This is the main cause of the great difference in the cost of production of sugar in the factories, since in the price of the other materials and products required for the production of sugar the difference is not great. The technical conditions scarcely play an important part, as nearly all of the factories have the latest improved machinery. It is necessary also to remember that independently of territorial difference in the beet root crop nowhere is there such extremes observed as in Russia in this crop between one year and another, in consequence of unfavorable conditions for growth thus making the cost at the factory much greater.

This is why it may be noticed that in a given factory in a given year the pood of sugar costs solely for its technical working 1 ruble and 55 kopecks, and in the next year, with the same amount of output, as much as 2 rubles per pood. On an average, therefore, if it is permitted to draw such an average, the pood of sand sugar for its technical working up costs about 1 ruble and 97 kopecks, and it is in view of this that the ministry of finance assumes in its estimate the cost at 2 rubles per pood.

(4) "The significance and prices current of 'export certificates,' which, according to common report, constitute the subject of traffic between the sugar factories in Russia."

Each factory is granted the right to place on the home market, with payment at fixed dates of an excise of rubles 1 75 kopecks per pood, the first 60,000 poods of sugar produced by it plus that percentage in excess of the 60,000 poods, which must be taken out of its production to complete the issue into the home market up to the amount of the quantity fixed for the given period.

EXAMPLE.—The number of sugar factories is 270 × 60,000 poods gives 16,560,000 poods. The output has been computed, together with balances carried over from the last period, at 52,000,000 poods. The quantity for the home market has been fixed at 36,000,000 poods, so that for this amount, besides the 16,560,000 poods, are required 19,440,000 poods. Therefore, excluding from the 52,000,000 poods these 16,560,000 poods, the remainder of 35,440,000 poods must be distributed in percentage proportion, i. e., it must be shown what percentage may still be placed on the home market and what may not be thus placed. After dividing the 19,440,000 poods by 35,440,000 poods we will find that on the home market, with payment of excise of rubles 1 75 kopecks per pood, may be placed 54.85 per cent of that total quantity of sugar for each factory, which the same will have in excess of the first 60,000 poods. The remaining 45.15 per cent of that same quantity constitute the surplus or the so-called "free reserve" which may be placed on the home market only on payment for each pood of rubles 1 75 kopecks so-called additional excise, independently of the payment of the excise at rubles 1 75 kopecks on the general basis.

The owner of the factory can not, however, place on the home market all the 45.15 per cent mentioned in the example, for the reason that the minister of finance regulates and controls a portion of this quantity, retaining it at the factory in the so-called "immovable reserve," the quantity thus held being fixed at the same time as the quantities for home consumption and export.

Vide: If the immovable reserve has been fixed, say at 3,544,000 poods, then out of the above-mentioned 35,440,000 poods are retained 10 per cent. This means that in the example given we arrive at the conclusion that the 35,440,000 poods will be distributed thus: 54.85 per cent, or 19,440,000 poods, in the free sugar; 10 per cent, or 3,544,000 poods, in the immovable reserve; 35.15 per cent, or 12,456,000 poods, for the export board, when it is freed from excise or for placing on the home market, but with payment in this latter case of the additional excise.

On shipment abroad of sugar which can not be placed on the home market without the payment of the additional excise, the latter—i. e., the excise—is guaranteed by approved securities, and for this sugar a certificate is given to the effect that the same has been manufactured at such a factory in such a year and figures in the category of "free reserve" and is being sent abroad through such custom-house. When thereafter this sugar arrives at the custom-house and has been shipped abroad, the customs authorities make an indorsement on the certificate and also issue to the shipper quittances, which are accepted in lieu of payment of the excise computed as being due on that sugar.

The manufacturer presents this certificate to the local excise administration, which sets the securities free which were deposited when the sugar was being removed from the factory. To avoid the necessity of giving securities as guarantee for additional excise, and in general for the greater freedom in business transactions, the manufacturer is granted the right to export abroad "free sugar"—i. e., that on which no additional excise is payable. For such sugar, on its being taken from the factory, a certificate is given, on which is written "Free sugar."

When thereafter this sugar is exported abroad and an indorsement is made on the customs certificate, then on presentation of this certificate to the local excise inspection the latter transfers to the "free sugar" an equal quantity from the "free reserve." It is of course understood that on the exportation abroad of free sugar the customs authorities also issue quittances, which are valid in lieu of payment of excise on sugar.

It is permitted to export free sugar abroad not only for the purpose of liberating for admission to the home market the "free reserve" of any one factory, but also of any other factory. For this purpose the owners of the factories who enter among themselves into such an agreement must notify their local excise officials, and these in turn must notify each other. That factory which desires to export abroad its free sugar, say 5,000 poods, for the account of another factory indicated by it asks for the transfer in its factory and excise books of 5,000 poods from the category of "free sugar" to the category of "free reserve," in order that from the category of the "free reserve" of the other manufacturer 5,000 poods may also be transferred to the category of "free sugar."

The other manufacturer hands in a notice for the liberation of 5,000 poods of the free reserve from the additional excise and its transfer to the category of free sugar, in view of the fact that in its place 5,000 poods of the free sugar have been transferred to the free reserve of the first manufacturer. Consequently the first manufacturer ceded to the second his right of placing on the home market 5,000 poods, which he can now only sell abroad or pass out into the home market after payment over and above the excise of the additional excise of Rs. 1.75 per pood. As the first and second methods of disposing of this sugar are less advantageous than placing the article on the home market as free sugar, the manufacturer who ceded his right receives from the manufacturer who acquired the right the price per pood agreed upon between them, which is usually determined by the difference existing at the moment between the price obtainable for the sugar on the home market and the price obtainable by sale abroad.

This is what is termed a transfer. Dependent on the fluctuations in price of sand sugar in Russia and abroad, the price of these transfers also varies; therefore the person who sells the transfer (the right of issue into the home market) charges several kopecks more than the difference mentioned above. This is done on account of the risk that is taken that sugar prices abroad may fall, and also for the trouble involved in exporting, etc.

EXAMPLE.—Price of sand sugar at a station in the southwestern region, (a) for the home market, Rs. 4.25 per pood, or without excise, Rs. 2.50; (b) for abroad, Rs. 1.25. Consequently the difference or value of transfer is Rs. 1.25, but in that case, for the reasons given, Rs. 1.23 to Rs. 1.30 is paid for the transfer.

The Russian Government, in order to regulate the sugar trade and to give the industry a solid basis, prescribes that a certain quantity of the surplus of all sugar mills or factories must be exported. Whether this sugar is exported direct from each factory or if one factory exports its whole production is immaterial to the Government. For example, 4 sugar factories far away from the shipping port have to export 50,000 poods each, or in all 200,000 poods. Another factory situated near a shipping port, to which the freight is cheaper, and with the demand for sugar not great, finds it more profitable to export its entire output (250,000 poods), and receives export

certificates for this quantity. These certificates are given to the owners of the 4 factories mentioned, and these in turn deliver 200,000 poods of sugar, which can be sold on the home market whenever the owner pleases.

It should have been stated that certificates to the extent of 200,000 poods are exchanged for the same quantity of sugar, and not 250,000 poods. These certificates can be sold to a bank or to a speculator who has engaged to deliver sugar at the port abroad to which the sugar was shipped. The Government also takes these certificates in payment of excise at par, i. e., 1 ruble 75 kopecks a pood.

The excise is levied on all kinds and qualities of sugar at the rate of 1 ruble 75 kopecks per pood. The payment of this excise is made at three different periods: One-third of all sugar placed in the accounts is paid for by June 1; one-third of all sugar placed in the accounts is paid for by September 1; one-third of all sugar placed in the accounts is paid for by December 1.

When sugar is taken out of a factory the manufacturer must pay on account of all the excise due on it 75 kopecks per pood in cash or in approved securities, and the factory property is guarantee for the 1 ruble remaining of the excise. For the greater security of the fiscal interests a law was passed on July 4, 1900, by virtue of which, commencing from September 1, 1901, greater security is demanded when sugar is taken from a factory, viz: From September 1, 1901, to September 1, 1902, will be levied 95 kopecks per pood; from September 1, 1902, to September 1, 1903, will be levied 1.15 kopecks per pood; from September 1, 1903, to September 1, 1904, will be levied 1.35 kopecks per pood; from September 1, 1904, to September 1, 1905, will be levied 1.55 kopecks per pood; from September 1, 1905, the total sum of all excise in full 1.75 kopecks per pood, so that from September 1, 1905, all factory property will cease to be considered as property available for the guarantee of excise. As regards the actual payment of the excise the time remains as above, viz, June 1, September 1, and December 1.

For payment the excise in future will be calculated at the same rate as at present on the free sugar and free reserve, but on the immovable reserve the excise will only be charged when the minister of finance will give the permission to place it on the home market.

The immovable reserve is formed for the purpose of placing on the home market in full or in part, with the permission of the minister, in those cases where the price of sand sugar at the stations of the southwestern region shall remain for two weeks at the level of the fixed limit or exceed that limit. If by virtue of the condition of the market during the given period no permission is given to place the immovable reserve on the home market (if the prices of sand sugar do not exceed the fixed limit), then all of it is added to the output of the following period.

For payment of the excise at the stipulated periods the Government accepts money in cash, and also those quittances on account of sugar exported abroad, which are given by custom-houses when said sugar is shipped abroad; also a quittance on account of sugar exported from any one factory is valid on account of the excise of any other factory. This quittance is made out in the name of the shipper of the cargo, and it is only necessary that the indorsement of the shipper regarding the transfer to the factory indicated by him in the indorsement should be attested. In these quittances is stated the quantity of the sugar shipped abroad and the sum of excise charged on it, calculating the same at the fixed rate of 1 ruble 75 kopecks per pood netto.

It may be of interest to give the exports of sugar from the 1st to 13th of January, 1900, to the 1st to 14th of August, 1900. They were as follows:

Via custom-houses at—	Poods.
Odessa.....	3,658,432
Miava.....	3,236,381
Libau.....	1,353,381
Petersburg.....	2,719
Alexandrovo.....	230,081
Volschik.....	380,223
Graev.....	86,620
Novoselitz.....	86,790
Nicolaiev.....	204,944
Neschava.....	210,924
Astrachan.....	44,445
Baku.....	2,045,966
Kelif.....	4,728
Kokand.....	3,624
Duschak.....	27,981
Aschabad.....	234,444
Julfin.....	57,797
Yarkent.....	2,168
Bashten.....	484
Irkutsk.....	118
Ongudelsk.....	7,549
Orubek.....	41
Jebrayl.....	31
Total.....	10,908,863

Of which 1,021,989 poods were refined sugar and 8,703,604 poods were white sand sugar.

The following circular from the minister of finance to the managers of excise was published July 21-3 August, 1900, and was numbered 589:

"REGARDING THE PERMISSION TO PLACE ON THE HOME MARKET WITHOUT THE PAYMENT OF ADDITIONAL EXCISE A PART OF THE IMMOVABLE RESERVE.

"From the particulars in possession of the ministry of finance it appears that during the time from the 1-14 to the 15-28 July, 1900, in the Kiev region, when white sand sugar was sold for delivery during the current period, the selling prices on an average were in excess of 4.60 rubles, i. e., in excess of the limit price named by the decree of the committee of ministers confirmed by His Majesty on the 18-30 June, 1899.

"In consequence of this, by virtue of paragraph 7 of the law of the 20th November-24 December, 1895, and the said imperial order of the 18-30 June, 1899, I find it necessary to permit the placing on the home market of 500,000 poods of sugar to be taken from the immovable reserve, and to add this quantity to the free sugar. Since the placing of this 500,000 poods of sugar on the home market will increase the free sugar for the current period from 35,500,000 poods to 36,000,000 poods, the additional account effected on the factories in accordance with circular No. 556 of May 19-1 June, 1900, must be so altered that there must be passed out over and above the first 60,000 poods on each factory 53.5 per cent and into the sugar of the immovable reserve 8.1 per cent from the amount of output of the factory, taken when the calculations were made in accordance with the said circular. Therefore out of the quantity of immovable reserve on hand at each factory, a part of it equal to 1.25 per cent of the amount of the output estimated at the drawing up of the additional calculation must be passed over to free sugar.

"It is understood that the Russian Government fixes the price of sugar to be sold on the home markets for two periods of time, namely, from the 1-14 September, 1900, to the 1-14 of January, 1901, and from the 1-14 of January, 1901, to the 1-14 of September, 1901. Whenever the limit price fixed by the

Government is reached, or exceeded for two weeks, at any of the stations of the Southwestern Railway, the Government orders sugar to be taken from the immovable reserve and placed on the home market with the object of lowering the price of this article within the Government limit. This action on the part of the Russian Government naturally has the effect of controlling, to a certain extent, the prices of sugar on the home market, but to a certain extent only.

"Sugar has time and again been sold on the home market above the price fixed by the Government, and the latter are quite powerless to stop it. The Government allow two weeks during which the price fixed may be reached or exceeded, and at the end of this period a sufficient quantity of the sugar from the immovable reserve is thrown on the market for the purpose of reducing the price. But if the sugar manufacturers had two entire weeks during which time they were free to sell sugar at a higher price than the Government limit, the principle of Government control falls to the ground. In my previous communication or report it was stated that the Russian Government estimated the cost of producing one pood of sugar at 2 rubles, and I accepted that estimate as being correct.

"I desire to add to my first statement and to report that I am now convinced that this estimate is too high. The cost per pood, on a fair and liberal estimate, does not, in my opinion, exceed on an average 1 ruble and 75 kopecks per pood. In conversation with a sugar manufacturer recently I was informed that the cost of producing 1 pood of sugar was 1 ruble and 50 kopecks. The price is fixed by the Government for sugar (home consumption) at the various stations situated in the southwestern district, and the limit applies to the sales made by the manufacturer to his various customers. The consumers, however, purchase for another and higher price; and this price at present reaches 5 rubles and 20 kopecks a pood. I have not touched on the question of refined sugar, as I assumed it had no bearing on the question involved, viz, whether the Russian system of excise amounted in reality to a bounty on sugar exported. The sugar mills produce the sand sugar from the beet root; and this sand sugar is sent to the refineries, in order that the various elements which go to make the loaf sugar may be extracted. The refineries charge from 75 kopecks to 90 kopecks per pood for the refining and have a profit of about 50 kopecks per pood. In regard to white or yellow sand sugar, there is no difference in the amount of the excise levied; both pay the 1 ruble and 75 kopecks per pood.

"The Treasury Department may be interested in knowing that the quantity of sugar for the home market has been fixed by the Russian Government for the period 1900-1901 at 36,000,000 poods, and this in face of the fact that the actual consumption of sugar in Russia during 1899-1900 amounted to 36,500,000 poods. Thus the yearly consumption of sugar in Russia has been fixed at half a million poods below the actual consumption for 1899-1900. This circumstance, even assuming that the consumption of sugar will not increase during the present period, will no doubt have a marked effect on the sugar market. The price fixed for the autumn and winter months of the current year, as well as next year to the 1-14 September, is 5 kopecks per pood lower than for the past year.

"Thus, by the conditions of the Government limit the pood of sand sugar may be sold from the 1-14 September of the present year to 1-14 January, 1901, without the excise, at 2 rubles 65 kopecks, and from 1-14 January, 1901, to 1-14 September, 1901, at 2 rubles 80 kopecks per pood. The actual advance sales of sugar for delivery during the autumn months of the current year do not reach the Government limit. The transactions on the Kiev exchange show that large quantities of sugar have been sold at prices ranging from 4 rubles 20 kopecks to 4 rubles 25 kopecks per pood, which, without the excise, represents 2 rubles 45 kopecks to 2 rubles 47 kopecks per pood at the railway station. This price shows, even if the estimate of cost of production be taken at 1 ruble 50 kopecks to 2 rubles, that the manufacturers have a fair margin of profit even with a large export, since with the price of Russian sugar in London at 13 shillings for 3 poods (about 2 rubles per pood) and with no loss on the sugar exported to the East and to Finland, it may be asserted with confidence that the Russian sugar industry is in a flourishing condition.

"In former years and up to the present time the government fixed the limit price for sugar to take effect at certain designated points in this southwestern region. From the 1st to the 14th of September of the current year and for the future the government announce that Rostoff has been added as a place to which the limit applies, and for all of the remainder of Russia the price limits which regulate the issue of sugar from the immovable reserve will be determined by the prices which prevail in the Kiev region and the freights to the various points."

"WHY IS SUGAR DEAR?"

[Translation of article from the St. Petersburg Novoe Vremya, November 9-22, 1900.]

The causes of the high price of sugar reside in that abnormal condition of the sugar industry from which it suffered for a long time, and lately in the artificial compulsion to export sugar, and in the restriction of the growth of home consumption. It is not possible to sell in Russia more sugar than is fixed in advance, and this is the principal cause of the fact that the prices can not descend to their own natural level, even in view of the present technical condition of the industry.

Thus, for instance, for the current period 1899-1900 the contingent of sugar is fixed at thirty-five and one-half million poods—same as in the past year, notwithstanding the increase of population and satisfactory crops. Whatever may be the quantity produced over the fixed contingent, the excess must be exported, and therefore can exert no influence to cause a lowering of the price at home; on the contrary, such excess even raises the home price, inasmuch as the export of sugar to certain countries—for instance, England—is unprofitable, and the manufacturers of sugar naturally endeavor to recover the loss at the expense of the home market. This, the restriction of the quantity allowed for home consumption, is a measure directly antagonistic to the cheapening of sugar, and is, moreover, exceedingly injurious to the revenue.

Sugar is dear because it can not be produced for the home market in an unlimited quantity. Therein consists the whole substance of the case. On this depends not only the high price of sugar, but also the slow progress of the industry itself and the amount of the revenue, which does not promise to yield for the present year as much as it should yield. Therefore the proposed reduction of the excise tax, of which the sugar manufacturers are speaking with such pleasure, may prove profitable to the consumers and result in no loss to the revenue only in case such reduction is coupled with the abolition of the existing restriction of production, which abolition is the condition sine qua non of cheapness of sugar, regular development of the sugar industry itself, and of normal increase of the revenue.

Mr. Chairman, no fault can justly be found with the action taken by the Secretary of the Treasury, and we all know that he is a most worthy successor of the great minds and distinguished men who have preceded him in that responsible position.

The Late Representative Harmer.

ADDRESS

OF

HON. HERNANDO D. MONEY,

OF MISSISSIPPI,

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Saturday, February 9, 1901,

Upon the resolutions submitted by Mr. PENROSE commemorative of the life, character, and public services of the Hon. ALFRED C. HARMER, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MONEY said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: It has been two decades and a lustrum since my acquaintance began with the subject of these eulogies. ALFRED C. HARMER entered the Forty-second Congress, served in the Forty-third, again reentered—after leaving out the Forty-fourth—the Forty-fifth Congress, and continued as a member of Congress until the day of his death. I was a member of the Forty-fourth Congress, and then became acquainted with him as with all the other Philadelphia members who have been so feelingly and affectionately remembered by my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER]. That was a time of intense political excitement.

Mr. HARMER lost his seat, I think, in the Forty-fourth Congress, because in that year there was an upheaval in politics, a sort of cataclysm that hurled from power the Republican party and placed in the House of Representatives a Democratic majority and from the South men who truly represented it. The South had not up to that time been represented by its own sons, and in that political revolution I, with a great many others, came into Congress from the South.

It happened that the fury of the conflict, which always affords to great men their opportunities, brought to the front the strong men of the North and of the South, and they met in that Congress, which, in my opinion, was the greatest that has ever assembled in the House of Representatives, if perhaps we may exclude some three or four of the first Congresses which had in their membership the men who framed the Constitution of the United States.

I had it in my mind this morning to call over the names of the distinguished men who composed that grand assembly of genius and of character. It is sad to note how many of them have passed to "that bourne whence no traveler e'er returns." Out of the 357 members now sitting in the House of Representatives only 2 of them were members of the Forty-fourth Congress—General KETCHAM, of New York, and Mr. CANNON, of Illinois, both of whom have not been serving uninterrupted terms.

The array, genius, talent, and character that met in political conflict upon the floor of the House of Representatives was not only remarkable for its greatness, but remarkable for its controversies. This great Republic at that time was settling questions of the most momentous importance. Vital interests, far-reaching policies and principles, were to be determined. It seemed as though the sections—the East, North, West, and South—had sent their best men to the controversy.

I desire to read the names of a few of the men I have noted here, those who are recognized as men of national character and importance who were then the members of that august body and who have now passed away.

I recollect very well Michael C. Kerr, the first Speaker of the House of Representatives in that Congress, to be followed by that distinguished Pennsylvanian who has been so well eulogized by my friend from New Hampshire, Samuel J. Randall, the man with a lion heart and with a consummate tact for the management of men and the resolution not to be daunted by any opposition.

Among the members was the brilliant, the witty, the humorous, the belles-lettres scholar, Sunset Cox—S. S. Cox. Also Richard P. Bland, whose agitation of the silver question so long and with such ability won him a world-wide reputation.

Following him was David B. Culbertson, probably the greatest lawyer the House has ever seen, or certainly one of its very first, and from the beginning of his career to the close of it always a commanding power in the House.

Next was Charles J. Faulkner, an old man, distinguished before the civil war in the House of Representatives, and who had served as a minister to France, an accomplished diplomat, and an old-time Virginia gentleman.

Then E. John Ellis, called the "eloquent" Ellis, of Louisiana, who, with a mellifluous voice and beautiful rhetoric, so often entertained the fancy and won the plaudits of audiences in every section.

Following him was David Dudley Field, one of the greatest lawyers New York has ever known and, I believe, the author of the movement to codify the laws of the States.

Then came James A. Garfield, afterwards the President of this

great Republic, a man of supreme intellectual power, of the most amiable personal character, a good companion, and a student of almost everything that came within his intellectual survey.

Following him was a man whose name was a name to conjure with—James G. Blaine, the brilliant American; a man with an intensely American foreign policy that he believed to be to the credit and to the glory of this country; a man who, I believe, at one time had a larger and a more affectionate personal following than any man who has ever figured in American politics, in my time at least.

Benjamin H. Hill, the lawyer, the orator, and the statesman, whose tremendous speeches had an effect in the House of Representatives in the Forty-fourth Congress that can be compared only to the discharges of heavy artillery upon a field of battle.

Frank H. Hurd, the distinguished lawyer and orator of Toledo, Ohio; a man recognized throughout the limits of this country as one of the very first legal minds in it, and when he spoke in the House he had the ear of every man who was in the Chamber.

L. Q. C. Lamar, who graced a place in this Chamber, passed from it into a Cabinet office, and afterwards became one of the associate justices of the Supreme Court—Lamar, the man of genius, the man of philosophy, and the man of affairs, whose eloquence was of that character which required study and thought, with no spontaneity, but with a magnificence of diction and profundity of thought that always impressed itself powerfully upon his hearers.

Henry B. Payne, afterwards a member of this body, a man who was an influence in Ohio second to none, a man of the purest and loftiest character.

Alexander H. Stephens—the poor little cripple, whose life was lived in a rolling chair, but whose intellect, whose character every one bowed to in profoundest respect—a most affectionate, amiable, and gentle nature, and yet with a heart as resolute and as courageous as ever beat within the human breast.

J. Randolph Tucker, the profound lawyer, the sagacious statesman, the exquisite wit, the humorist. What a lovable companion! How delightful the memory he leaves to the circle of admirers he left behind him!

William A. Wheeler, called from the House of Representatives to sit in that chair and preside over the deliberations of the Senate as Vice-President of the United States by the votes of its people.

Casey Young, the great lawyer and orator from Tennessee, who only died last year, the friend of my heart; the man who was nearer to me, perhaps, than any other man; whose good traits were so numerous that they can hardly be enumerated in this place.

Jere Rusk, the big, stalwart man from the West, breezy, bold, frank, broad-minded in every respect; who afterwards became Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and governor of his State.

Omar D. Conger, a man of biting wit, with a sarcasm that nobody could resist, who was transferred to this Chamber and distinguished himself here by his usefulness.

William D. Kelley, who has been alluded to by my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER]—a man whom I knew well and intimately. He was a disciple of Henry Carey, and he never omitted an opportunity anywhere to preach his doctrine with great force and effect—a man of genial nature, companionable in every respect, and one of the remarkable men of the Forty-fourth Congress.

The next name I have on this list, which stretches out so long, is George W. McCrary, of Iowa, who became Secretary of War—well poised, a lawyer, eminent in council and in debate, and in every way worthy of the honors which he received.

Fernando Wood, who was once the great mayor of New York, and who became a figure of influence and importance in the Forty-fourth and many succeeding Congresses—a man who, I believe, at one time during the civil war had the audacity to declare, as her mayor, the independence of the city of New York.

Alfred M. Scales, of North Carolina—a thorough gentleman, a fine lawyer, afterwards governor of North Carolina.

Then from that Congress there were men transferred to this Chamber who are now living—Joseph C. S. Blackburn, the Kentucky genius, who has his moments of inspiration, who has that peculiar manner, which Jefferson Davis had, of injecting into common conversation the most thrilling sentiments.

WILLIAM P. FRYE, the distinguished presiding officer of this Chamber, whom we all delight to honor—a man bold in his conflicts, ready in his retort, capable in every sense, enthusiastic, industrious, indefatigable, and resolute.

EUGENE HALE, Senator from Maine, broad-minded, scholarly, capable, eloquent, able to take care of himself anywhere.

GEORGE F. HOAR, the erudite scholar, lawyer, and statesman, whose eloquence has been the delight of this Senate and who never speaks but to instruct the Senate.

Then I have the names of some other men here who have retired

to private life to enjoy repose of declining years, who had figured as conspicuous characters in the Forty-fourth Congress. J. Proctor Knott, the Kentucky humorist, who made the great Duluth speech and the speech on improvements in Washington, which will go down to the remotest ages of English-speaking posterity as the best specimens of American humor.

Roger Q. Mills, who lately departed from this Senate an honored member, capable of great work, forceful in language, and in every regard worthy of the respect of his constituents and of all men.

W. R. Morrison, the author of the Morrison bill, whose courage and fidelity to principle secured him a long service in the House of Representatives and the admiration of Democrats wherever one exists.

James Wilson, who was, perhaps, the best parliamentarian in the House, and who is the Secretary of Agriculture in this Administration—a man whose intelligent, careful, economical, and efficient management of that Department has marked a new era in its career and evidences a future usefulness for it that the people of this country, one-half of whom are agriculturists, fully appreciate.

John A. Kasson, who is known now, and was then, as one of the first men of the House, a logical speaker, a ready debater, an accomplished diplomat. His speech before the Electoral Commission in 1876 was one of the best. He has been since in the employ of our Government as a diplomat. He has shown the most consummate skill in his negotiation of reciprocity treaties.

Henry W. Blair, who came from the House of Representatives to the Senate and distinguished himself here by a long career of usefulness and by his advocacy of educating all of the population at the cost of the General Government.

Then there is JOSEPH G. CANNON, who is to-day the Father of the House, who has had long service there, interrupted only by one term, and has shown the greatest capacity for public business.

A. S. Hewitt, of New York, a millionaire, who succeeded in everything he undertook; a cool, sagacious, level-headed man, who rarely spoke, but always spoke with effect.

Adlai E. Stevenson, late Vice-President of the United States, and last year again the nominee of his party for that high office, who presided over the deliberations of this Senate, clear-headed, cool, amiable, judicial-minded, fair, an honor to his country, and, I believe, the favorite of Democrats everywhere, but I am sure, also, the friend of all with whom he served in the Senate on either side of the Chamber.

Gen. Eppa Hunton, now of this city, one of the gallant Confederate officers who distinguished himself during the civil war, a former member of that House, a member of the Electoral Commission, who afterwards came to this Chamber, where he continued the usefulness which distinguished him in the House.

The last one I have left on this list is John H. Reagan, afterwards a member of this body. He resigned his place here to take the chairmanship of the railroad commission of the State of Texas. He is the last surviving member of the Confederate cabinet, the counselor of Jefferson Davis, honest, fearless, devoted to popular rights.

These are some of the members of that remarkable Congress, with too many of scarcely inferior rank.

In the Forty-fourth Congress, among this array of orators and speakers, I do not recollect that I ever heard Mr. HARMER make a speech. I did not know him intimately, but socially I knew him very well. He was a reticent man. He rarely spoke when anybody else wanted to do so, but he was always ready to answer intelligently any questions that were put to him. He was direct; he was amiable; he was trustworthy, and the best evidence of this is that for so long a time his constituency considered him worthy to represent them in the House.

He had great committee work to do, and he did it unostentatiously and well. He never paraded himself in politics or in society or anywhere else; but he was a successful man. He had a cool mind, a keen insight into business. He knew the trend of events. He invested his money wisely, and he tried almost everything—mines, railroads, real estate, manufacturing—and was successful in all of them; and after he entered public life he was still successful. In other words, he was a model American in many respects, a man of great dignity of character, of never-failing courtesy, of easy manners, charitable, and lovable.

He was an indulgent father. He was loved by his family. He performed all the duties that devolved upon him in his long career—that of being a good father, a good husband, a good neighbor, and a good citizen.

His religious convictions were not subject of talk, but they were deep. I do not know to what church he belonged, nor whether he belonged to any; but he was one of those calm and practical minded men who believe that our lives here fix the conditions of our souls hereafter: that there is a here and a hereafter; and if he was correct—and I believe he was—then in that future world, when the roll is called of all who were worthy of good report here below, he can answer, "I am here."

We know nothing but by authority of what is beyond. The philosophers from ages untold have attempted to demonstrate to us the future life, the immortality of the soul. Plato asserted it, Socrates proved it, Addison, the poet, believed in it and quoted Plato to justify his belief. There has not been a generation of mankind of any nation anywhere that has not acknowledged the existence of a God and believed in the immortality of the soul.

The Accadian religion, the religion of the Chaldeans, a religion which Abraham carried with him down from the city of Ur, and which his successors carried to Egypt—take their invocations, their hymns, their prayers, and you find that all are to the same Almighty God, the Father of all. All speak of the future life in invocations for Divine mercy and forgiveness of sin. The ancient Egyptian religion—a religion which left such magnificent fragments of its splendid temples to be reflected in the bosom of the Nile and to excite the wonder and admiration for five thousand years. Take that fertile strip barred by the rocky hills, and beyond the hills the tawny waste of desert sand, and in that valley, which was so long the seat of enterprise, of commerce, of literature, of architecture, of arts and sciences, and they, too, believed in the future life with an intensity of conception to which we are strangers. They would even have made the body immortal, and in their tombs we find to-day a hymnal—the book of the dead—in which the soul was instructed in what it should say when it appears before those inflexible judges who shall pronounce the sentence and decide its fate—"Have you done this?" and "Have you done that?"—and the soul must answer truly to them.

Everywhere, even in the worship of the American Indians, and especially in the Peruvian mythology, you will find prayers and invocations, showing their belief not only in the eternity of the soul and of a future existence, but in a state of reward and punishment and of a Divine Being with power to condemn or to be merciful, the Giver of all good gifts. A preacher might take one of those prayers—the prayer to Pachumac, for instance—and deliver it next Sunday in any Christian pulpit, and no one of the congregation would know but that it was a beautiful creation from the brain of the Christian pastor.

In all ages men have believed in the immortality of the soul. Later we find scientists arguing upon purely scientific bases, and by scientific processes, without quoting any authority whatever, although they are Christian believers, have demonstrated to a scientific conclusion that the soul shall forever live.

We walk through that door into another chamber, and from that to another, and no man knows whence we go. So we pass down to the narrow portals of the tomb, and we disappear from the gaze of the world. Our friends are heartstricken with grief for a little while, but soon we are forgotten, we are a mere memory, and after a while a tradition; but the busy world with its thronging multitudes moves on, absorbed in its politics, its commerce, its business.

When the soul has gone beyond the portals of the tomb, when it has shaken off the flesh and its impedimenta here, then in the eternal hereafter we may know that all of that which we call "the past," "the dark backward and abyss of time," that flitting, flitting moment which we call "the present," and that coming which we call "the future" are all merged in one "now," and there is no past, present, or future, but all is now. There is no place, but all is "here," and above all is the goodness of the Creator, the Father of all.

Father of all, in every age,
In every clime adored,
By saint, by savage, or by sage,
Jehovah, Jove, or Lord.

Mourning for departed relatives or friends is simply an animal instinct, the pain of breaking the tender tendrils about the heart. It is the pang of separation that gives death its terror; nothing else. Who fears to meet the future? Is there any man afraid? If so, then let him change his course. How men rush to the cannon's mouth, how they risk perils on sea and land, and how little they think of death! What small terror it has for any man, whatever his belief may be as to the future!

And, after all, Mr. President, every heart must feel that sooner or later we must go to face the realities of which we have all thought and dreamed, and solve the great mystery of life and the still greater mystery of death. It has been said that—

It is not all of life to live,
Nor all of death to die.

That means that there is something in this life that is projected into the life beyond; that the soul can not cast aside everything which it now has, but carries with it into the future existence something of the "now," something of the "here." We are told that the subjective mind, which controls the automatic functions of the body, and which takes care of us when we are asleep and when we are unconscious of the effort to breathe or to pulsate our hearts—that subjective mind is the part that will live hereafter. We are told that of the different nerve centers that one is the physiological base of the soul.

Every nation has its belief upon these points, but all agree upon one great fact—that there is a hereafter, and that in that hereafter the soul must take its stand as it ordained for itself in this world. There is no interference; there is no help. Of course the mind must yield to heredity and environment, but, after all, it is responsible for its own efforts.

In view of these facts, when I consider our departed friend, when I think of his kindly good nature, of his amiability, of his charity, of his self-respect, of his gentle bearing, of his sense of right, of honor, and of justice, of his fair dealing with his fellow-men, I think he has exercised at least the religion of humanity, and, like Abou Ben Adhem, when he awoke from his dream of peace and asked the angel if his name was written in the Book of Life. "Not so," the angel said. "Then," said Ben Adhem—

Write me as one who loves his fellow-men.

The angel smiled and showed him the book—

And lo! Ben Adhem's name led all the rest.

Hawaiian Silver Coinage.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. KNOX,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, February 4, 1901.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 7001) relating to Hawaiian silver coinage and silver certificates—

Mr. KNOX said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The purpose of this bill is to take up the Hawaiian silver coinage that was outstanding at the date of the acquisition of the islands by the United States. These islands are now a part of the territory of the United States just as much as Arizona or New Mexico; and these people obviously should have the same circulating medium as that in use throughout the rest of the Union, and the same laws governing their coinage.

The commission that was sent there at the time of the adoption of the annexation resolution reported a form of government and at the same time a bill providing for the taking up of this coinage of the Hawaiian Islands. That bill in the last Congress, when it was introduced, was sent to one of the financial committees of the House—I think the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures—and was favorably reported by that committee, but was not passed by the House.

At the present Congress all matters relating to Hawaii were sent to the Committee on Territories. The pending bill went to that committee, and they reported the same with certain amendments which do not appear in the report of the committee, but do not go to the merits of the bill, but simply change the phraseology, and I shall ask unanimous consent to have them adopted when action is taken on the bill.

When the commission went to the Hawaiian Islands the coinage of the islands consisted of about \$1,000,000 in silver, which had been coined at the United States mint at San Francisco. I think \$500,000 were coined in the full legal-tender dollars, \$250,000 in halves, \$125,000 in quarters, and \$25,000 in dimes. I am informed, with reference to the situation there now, that the dime has practically disappeared from the Hawaiian currency, and that leaves this currency outstanding which this bill undertakes to provide shall be exchanged for the silver coinage of the United States.

Provision is made for its exchange in the first and second sections, the first making this Hawaiian currency receivable for all dues to the Hawaiian government or to the United States, but, when once received, that it shall not be paid out again, but shall be recoined in the mints of the United States. The second section provides as follows:

SEC. 2. That when such coins have been received by either Government in sums not less than \$500, they shall be deposited as bullion in the mint at San Francisco, Cal., and shall be recoined in pieces of the same denominations as nearly as may be. And the superintendent of the said mint shall pay for such coins, at their face value, to the proper officer or agent of the Government depositing the same, the sum so deposited, in standard silver coins of the United States. The expenses of transmitting said coins to and from the Hawaiian Islands shall be borne equally by the United States and the government of Hawaii.

In addition to that, there is a provision for taking up the mutilated currency—that is, that which has become so mutilated as to be not redeemable—and that provision is contained in the fourth section in the following words:

SEC. 4. That any silver coins struck by the government of Hawaii that are mutilated or abraded below such standard may be presented for recoinage at any mint in the United States by the person owning the same, or his or her agents, in sums of not less than \$50, and such owner shall be paid for such coins by the superintendent of the mint the bullion value per troy ounce of the fine silver they contain in standard silver coin of the United States.

Now, the provision of the bill is simply to exchange American silver coin for Hawaiian silver coin, and the sixth section provides that no seigniorage or mint charges shall be made by the United States, and that the expense of transportation shall be equally borne by the two Governments.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. KNOX. Certainly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I am not familiar with the provisions of the bill, not having seen it before this moment. What value do the silver coins circulating in the Hawaiian Islands have at this time?

Mr. KNOX. They circulate at their face value; that is, they have a dollar, a half dollar, a quarter, and a dime. These coins are practically of the same intrinsic value as the United States coins, but they have not the United States stamp and are not United States money.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Do they pass for the same value in making purchases in the islands?

Mr. KNOX. They did, of course, before annexation, but now they are subject to exchange.

Mr. SHAFROTH. What I want to get at is this: The denominations used there are dollars, half dollars, quarters, and dimes. Does the dollar which is stamped with the stamp of the Hawaiian government pass there at its commercial value or at the value which the United States dollar has?

Mr. KNOX. It passes at its commercial value; that is, it is not United States money, but the coins are called dollars, halves, and quarters, and have the same purchasing power as before annexation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. How does the dollar pass?

Mr. KNOX. That passes as a dollar up to \$10. Hawaiian silver coin is a legal tender up to \$10.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I understand that; but the question is, at what value does it pass? Does it pass at the same value as the United States dollar or at the bullion value?

Mr. KNOX. It passes in Hawaii as a dollar, but only as it passed before annexation, not as an American dollar.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Is its purchasing power as high as that of the dollar of the United States?

Mr. KNOX. Yes; because it contains substantially the same amount of silver as the United States dollar, and it is supposed that it will finally be exchanged for United States coin.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That would be its commercial value, or the bullion value.

Mr. KNOX. It is practically the same in Hawaii, but differs from the United States dollar because in Hawaii it is only legal tender to a limited amount.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, I understand; but is its purchasing power as great as the purchasing power of the United States dollar?

Mr. KNOX. That I can not say.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, it seems to me that is a very important thing to be ascertained before we pass this legislation.

Mr. KNOX. Why?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Because, if debts are made payable in that country in the Hawaiian dollar, and Hawaiian dollars have simply their bullion value, and those debts have ultimately to be paid in American dollars, it would mean doubling the amount which the debtor had to pay.

Mr. KNOX. Oh, no; it stands just the same.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It would double the hardships of the debtor; and I believe that ought not to be done.

Mr. KNOX. Oh, no; the Hawaiian dollars pass at their full value. They are legal tender up to \$10.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I understand that, but if they are legal tender only for their bullion value the purchasing power would not be as great as the purchasing power of an American silver dollar.

Mr. GAINES. Does the Hawaiian dollar pass at its face value?

Mr. KNOX. Oh, certainly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. At the face value of their dollar; but is the face value of their dollar as great in purchasing power as our dollar? In other words, does the Hawaiian dollar now exchange one for one with the American dollar?

Mr. KNOX. It would in Hawaii, but if you are going to transport it to the United States it is subject to exchange, because it is not an American dollar.

Mr. GAINES. This coinage is to be used in Hawaii?

Mr. KNOX. Certainly; it is for Hawaii alone.

Mr. GAINES. Then why do you want to enact this law?

Mr. KNOX. Because they need American money, and they are obliged now, in settling debts with America and in transporting their money, to pay the exchange. Let me read you a communication which I have received, showing the situation on January 18:

BANKING HOUSE OF BISHOP & Co.,
Honolulu, January 18, 1901.

WILLIAM HAYWOOD, Esq.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Before you left Honolulu we mentioned the subject of the Hawaiian silver coinage as a disturbing element here. It is becoming more and more so; for now that we are part of the United States it is essential that our coinage

should be upon the same footing in all respects. To be part of the United States and at the same time have a currency which has been issued by this government and yet legal tender for \$10 only here, and not legal tender for any amount in other parts of the United States, is the cause of much trouble and disturbance in our financial relations.

We are certainly placed in a very unpleasant position. The customs, postal, and internal-revenue offices are withdrawing from this Territory over a million and a half annually in gold coin, and thus far no attention has been paid to our needs. It seems hardly fair that we are called upon to meet all our obligations and at the same time be taxed to this amount in addition, and that is what it really comes to.

Any assistance you can render will be greatly appreciated here. As you know, we have written to Secretary Gage and he has promised to give the matter his attention, but, so far as the papers report, there seems to be no action on Hawaiian affairs.

With kindest regards, we are,
Yours, truly,

BISHOP & CO.

All the Hawaiian circulation is this silver, except gold. There is about \$2,000,000 of gold, and gold is the only unlimited legal tender there is in the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Is silver there exchangeable for gold?

Mr. KNOX. Where?

Mr. SHAFROTH. In Hawaii.

Mr. KNOX. It was, but I suppose it is not now, except at a discount, because gold is a full legal tender.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If you want to get gold there, dollar for dollar, how much of a discount do you have to pay?

Mr. KNOX. I am not informed what the discount is at the present time.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Do you know whether there is a discount?

Mr. KNOX. I do not, but I should suppose there would be, when they have to get gold for exchange. Gold is the only unlimited legal tender.

Mr. GAINES. Are the American gold and silver dollars full legal tender?

Mr. KNOX. In Hawaii silver is a legal tender only to the amount of \$10. Gold is the only unlimited legal tender there is there.

Mr. GAINES. Is it an unlimited legal tender in Hawaii?

Mr. KNOX. Yes; and it is the only unlimited legal tender there.

Mr. GAINES. How did it get to be a legal tender?

Mr. KNOX. It always was, by law and by intrinsic value both.

Mr. GAINES. Not before we annexed?

Mr. KNOX. Oh, yes; gold has always been an unlimited legal tender there.

Mr. GAINES. It has been a legal tender there since Hawaii became a part of the United States.

Mr. KNOX. Yes; both before and since.

Mr. GAINES. If you bring this Hawaiian coin here to the United States to be recoined, is it to be recoined into other Hawaiian dollars, or are we to coin it into United States dollars?

Mr. KNOX. Into United States dollars. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. GAINES. Then when it goes back to Hawaii it is United States silver coin?

Mr. KNOX. Yes.

Mr. GAINES. And is no longer coined in the shape of the old Hawaiian dollar.

Mr. KNOX. That is it exactly.

Mr. GAINES. How much do they lose per dollar? And is it free coinage, or does the party who brings it have to pay to have it coined?

Mr. KNOX. No; under section 6 of the bill, no seigniorage or mint dues or charges shall be paid or retained for the recoinage of this coin at any mint of the United States under the provisions of this act.

So we make no charge for seigniorage, and if we should lose a little by the coinage it would be small. This is simply an exchange of United States money for Hawaiian money of the same denomination, in order that there may be the same coinage in all the States and Territories of the United States.

Mr. GAINES. This is an exchange, because the Hawaiian coin is brought over here and made into a dollar. It is not a swap or exchange?

Mr. KNOX. It is necessary both to the Territory of Hawaii and the Government of the United States that we should pass this bill. This money accumulates, and when it is once received under the provisions of the bill it is not paid out, but it is recoined and the American money is sent back without charge for transportation, the cost of transportation being equally divided between the Government of the United States and Hawaii.

Mr. GAINES. Another question. Is our silver dollar a full legal tender in Hawaii?

Mr. KNOX. Of course the silver dollar of the United States is legal tender wherever the United States owns the territory and its flag floats.

Mr. LOUD. Now, will the gentleman allow me one question?

Mr. KNOX. Certainly.

Mr. LOUD. You are taking, I understand, the Hawaiian dollar and coining whatever the silver dollar contains into a silver dollar of the United States?

Mr. KNOX. I shall ask unanimous consent to so amend the bill

as that it may be coined into such coins as the Secretary of the Treasury may desire. It may be determined it is wiser to coin it into subsidiary coin.

Mr. LOUD. At all events, the silver coinage of Hawaii is now in the hands of a few people, who have accepted it at a discount. Will not your act breathe into the Hawaiian silver, bought at perhaps 60 and 70 cents, a hundred cents of American gold?

Mr. KNOX. I do not see how that can be the effect. If we are to take it, if we are to have American coin, you may say that the speculator may get hold of it, but the coin is circulating at parity with American coin just the same. When a piece of this money comes in, it can not be paid out, and each American dollar when it goes there will be a legal tender under the laws of the United States, as it ought to be.

Mr. LOUD. I will ask the gentleman this question: Are we not paying in your exchange more than the bullion value of this money to these people who have this money now, and which they have got by accepting it at a discount, of which there is no doubt they have, or will very soon? Now, then, they have the right now to take the silver and get it coined into bullion and sell it for its—

Mr. KNOX. What do you mean by coining into bullion?

Mr. LOUD. They can get its full market value for it anywhere. I am afraid your bill will make the coin in the hands of a few people, accepted at a discount, worth a hundred cents of American money.

Mr. KNOX. There is not a million dollars in the whole Territory of Hawaii. There are but \$500,000 that were ever coined into silver dollars of the legal-tender money of Hawaii.

Mr. LOUD. I understand that.

Mr. KNOX. Three hundred and twelve thousand of that is in the treasury of Hawaii, represented by silver certificates.

Mr. LOUD. But, if the gentleman will bear with me, in order to do that these coins are taken at about 50 cents, and do not you blow into these one hundred?

Mr. KNOX. There is no such distinction. The intrinsic value of the coins is substantially the same.

Mr. LOUD. But you do not exchange on intrinsic value.

Mr. KNOX. It purchases in Hawaii and circulates in Hawaii at the face value of the dollar.

Mr. LOUD. I understand that; but have not a certain few men got it in their possession? I will ask you again if the greater amount of the silver coinage of Hawaii is now in the hands of a few, accepted by them at a legitimate discount?

Mr. KNOX. I am informed that exactly the opposite is true. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Mint were before the committee, and they said exactly, on that point, that it was not; that it was in circulation in small amounts of money. It is a very limited amount; \$500,000 of legal tender is all there has ever been coined.

Mr. LOUD. Why not fix the value as we did in Porto Rico?

Mr. KNOX. It is not fair and it is not just to take this Territory of Hawaii, which has this small amount in silver dollars circulating, and for this great Government to undertake to make a sharp bargain or a broker's bargain with the people of the Territory. It was different with Porto Rico.

Mr. LOUD. I do not think it is necessary to submit to be robbed so as to do fair.

Mr. GAINES. Who is being robbed?

Mr. KNOX. There is no robbery.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. KNOX. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES. The gentleman from California thinks that you are breathing 100 cents into this Hawaiian coin by permitting Hawaii, that is subject to our laws and Constitution, to come here with its coin; and you do not take it at its bullion value, but give it substantially coin value?

Mr. KNOX. Oh, no.

Mr. GAINES. Suppose the dollar is abraded.

Mr. KNOX. The bill provides for that.

Mr. GAINES. Suppose it was abraded down to 60 cents and the man brought you 100 of them, would you give him a hundred dollars?

Mr. KNOX. That is regulated by the rules of the Mint, which provide distinctly for mutilated coin. They take it at its value per Troy ounce.

Mr. GAINES. Is that according to its bullion value?

Mr. KNOX. Yes.

Mr. GAINES. Then you would not give the man who brought you a hundred abraded down to 60 cents \$100?

Mr. KNOX. No; we would give him the same as we would give you.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Knox].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, this bill was before the Committee on

Coinage, Weights, and Measures and was carefully considered. If there was any confusion in my answers to the gentleman from Colorado, it was on account of the rapidity and multiplicity of his questions. The whole testimony was that the Hawaiian dollar circulates in Hawaii at its full face value. I did say that the Hawaiian dollar contains just the same or substantially the same amount of silver as the American dollar, and is equally valuable intrinsically.

Now, in conclusion, I would ask would it be right for this Government to annex the Territory of Hawaii, making the people citizens of the United States, and then, if there was a depreciation upon their currency, take advantage of that as a speculation at the expense of the people of the islands we annex?

We have made the islands a part of American territory. We have made their people an American people. They are part and parcel of the great Republic. They have this coin, which was coined in the mint at San Francisco in 1884, 1885, and 1886. The coins were of the same fineness and contained the same amounts of silver as those which circulate with us. They have been legal tender to the amount of \$10 continuously since they were first coined until the present, and have purchased of commodities in the islands always their full face value. They buy to-day just the same and just as much as the American silver dollar, but of course in the dealings between Hawaii and foreign countries and the dealings between Hawaii and the people of the United States these silver coins must lose something in exchange.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does the dollar there to which the gentleman refers circulate at par with the American dollar—

Mr. KNOX. Yes; as I have just stated—

Mr. SLAYDEN (continuing). And that 3 per cent is the bankers' exchange? Now, is it probable, if this coin does so circulate, that anybody would have an opportunity to buy the coin at a greater discount than that at which they are now selling?

Mr. KNOX. I do not think so.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Because if they do I would like to go into the business myself.

Mr. KNOX. I do not see how any money is to be made in that way. Certainly I hope that if any is to be made it will not be by the Government of the United States.

Appropriations of the Fifty-sixth Congress Reduced \$128,150,091.89 Under Those of the Fifty-fifth Congress.

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. G. CANNON,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, March 4, 1901.

The House having under consideration the subject of appropriations—
Mr. CANNON said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The appropriations of the session just closing aggregate, as nearly as can be ascertained at this time, \$729,911,683.07. This sum includes \$123,782,688.75 for the postal service and \$53,000,000 for the sinking fund. It is believed that when the proof totals of the several bills come to be made they will not vary substantially in amount from the sum named.

I will submit as a part of my remarks a table showing, by titles of bills, the appropriations made at each of the regular sessions of the present and of the last Congress, covering the four fiscal years 1899, 1900, 1901, and 1902.

The increase over the appropriations made at the first session of this Congress is less than \$20,000,000; and this sum is more than accounted for by the increase of \$10,124,450 made on account of the postal service and by \$13,513,057.08 in the bill that provides for the maintenance of our naval establishment and for the construction, armor, and armament of the new ships of the Navy.

Slight increases are shown in the bills providing for the Agricultural Department, the Army, the diplomatic and consular service, the government of the District of Columbia, fortifications, the Indian service, and for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses; but these increases are more than offset by the substantial reductions which are indicated in the sundry civil act, in deficiencies, and for permanent appropriations. Included in the last named is the provision for our annual interest charge, which, by legislation enacted by this Congress, has been reduced in a sum that will amount annually to \$9,400,000.

The increase on account of miscellaneous objects is occasioned by the appropriation of \$5,250,000 authorized by legislation at the first session of this Congress for the St. Louis Exposition.

The total appropriations made at the two sessions of this, the Fifty-sixth, Congress are \$128,150,091.89 less than the appropria-

tions made during the two regular sessions of the preceding Congress.

The new revenue law passed at this session will, it is estimated, reduce taxes for the coming fiscal year \$41,000,000, bringing our total estimated income for the coming fiscal year, including postal revenues, to \$675,633,042.

Of the total appropriations made at this session, at least \$30,000,000 will not, in the light of past experience, be expended. This considerable margin between actual expenditures and appropriations made by Congress indicates a sum total of expenditures during the fiscal year 1902 of not exceeding \$699,911,683.07; and this sum includes \$53,000,000 on account of the sinking-fund requirements for the fiscal year 1902, which, of course, under the terms of the law, will be met only to such extent as surplus revenues in the Treasury may permit. After meeting the fullest ordinary requirements of the public service under the appropriations which have been made, there will surely remain sufficient revenue for 1902 to meet not less than \$30,000,000 of the requirements of the sinking fund, amounting in all, as stated, to \$53,000,000; and from other surplus money in the Treasury the whole sinking-fund obligations for the year can and will be met, if deemed expedient by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The large deficiencies provided for during the fiscal year 1899 by the first regular session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, amounting to \$349,772,389.96, were designed almost in their entirety to cover the expenses of the military and naval establishments during the fiscal years 1899 and 1900, incident to the war with Spain.

The most marked increase indicated in the appropriations for ordinary expenses of the Government made for the two years 1901 and 1902 at the two sessions of this Congress over those of the two preceding years, 1899 and 1900, provided for by the Fifty-fifth Congress, is for the postal service. This is the one branch of the public service that can not be restrained in its growth. It registers with precision and exactness the welfare of the nation and the agricultural, industrial, and commercial condition of the country. That the growth of the postal service for the two years provided for by this Congress is nearly 8 per cent greater than was the growth of the appropriations made therefor by the Fifty-fifth Congress over that provided for by the Fifty-fourth Congress is a source of congratulation.

It is an axiomatic truth in economic science that in order to reduce taxes public expenditures must first be retrenched. Acting upon this philosophy, the appropriations, as I have shown, have been reduced \$128,150,091.89 by this Congress under those provided for by its predecessor, and this has rendered possible a reduction of taxes in the sum of \$41,000,000.

With a continuance of the wise Administration now enjoyed by the country, there is every reason to anticipate a further reduction of public expenditures in the near future and a corresponding further reduction of taxes.

Appropriations made by the Fifty-fifth and Fifty-sixth Congresses, fiscal years 1899-1902.

Title of bill.	Fifty-fifth Congress.		Fifty-sixth Congress.	
	Appropriations, 1899.	Appropriations, 1900.	Appropriations, 1901.	Appropriations, 1902.
Agriculture.....	\$3,500,202.00	\$3,736,022.00	\$4,023,500.00	\$4,578,400.00
Army.....	23,193,392.00	30,430,204.06	114,230,065.53	115,735,649.10
Diplomatic and consular.....	1,752,208.76	1,714,533.76	1,771,168.70	1,850,228.76
District of Columbia.....	6,436,880.07	6,834,535.77	7,577,339.31	8,504,969.94
Fortification.....	9,377,494.00	4,900,902.00	7,383,628.00	7,504,011.00
Indian.....	7,673,854.90	7,504,775.81	8,187,980.24	9,596,221.39
Legislative, etc.....	21,625,846.65	23,410,840.79	24,175,632.53	24,690,758.85
Military Academy.....	458,689.23	575,774.47	674,306.67	747,653.68
Navy.....	56,086,783.68	48,099,909.58	65,140,916.87	78,653,973.75
Pension.....	141,233,830.00	145,233,830.00	145,245,230.00	145,245,230.00
Post-Office.....	99,222,300.75	105,634,138.75	113,658,238.75	123,782,688.75
River and harbor.....		16,091,841.94	560,000.00	
Sundry civil.....	48,490,212.26	48,385,930.86	65,319,915.45	62,553,108.21
Total.....	419,032,694.30	492,552,290.79	557,948,010.93	583,212,888.13
Deficiencies.....	349,772,389.96	25,005,912.26	15,688,330.61	14,340,574.94
Total.....	768,835,084.26	517,558,212.05	573,636,341.54	597,553,463.07
Miscellaneous.....	6,580,311.29	28,744,590.24	3,802,301.84	8,000,000.00
Total regular annual appropriations.....	775,395,395.55	546,302,802.29	577,438,643.38	605,553,463.07
Permanent annual appropriations.....	117,836,230.00	128,678,230.00	132,712,230.00	124,358,230.00
Grand total regular and permanent annual appropriations.....	893,231,615.55	674,981,032.29	710,150,863.38	729,911,693.07
Grand total appropriations by Congresses.....	1,568,212,637.84		1,440,062,545.95	

Appropriations Increased \$395,482,272.08 for the Fiscal Years 1901-1902 over Appropriations for the Two Years 1897-1898.

REMARKS

OF

HON. L. F. LIVINGSTON,

OF GEORGIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, March 4, 1901.

The House having under consideration the subject of appropriations—

Mr. LIVINGSTON said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I submit a statement giving the appropriations made by the Fifty-fourth Congress and the Fifty-sixth Congress covering the fiscal years 1897-98 and 1901-02. The Fifty-fourth Congress was the last one that made appropriations for the support of the Government prior to the beginning of the Spanish-American war.

The Fifty-sixth Congress (the one just closed) is the first Congress appropriating for the support of the Government since the close of the so-called Spanish-American war. The difference between the appropriations made by the Fifty-sixth Congress and those made by the Fifty-fourth Congress amounts to \$395,482,272.08.

During the session just closed the demands of the people, through their representatives, for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal, have gone unheeded; for new public buildings they have been persistently denied. The river and harbor bill has been permitted to fail. The payment of just claims of honest people against the Government has not been provided for.

It is doubtless conceived to be wisdom on the part of the leadership of the dominant party in Congress and the Administration to have denied these just demands of the people in order to provide for this enormous increase in expenditures that is almost wholly required in order to support the increased military establishment that has been inaugurated under the policy of the Republican party.

Notwithstanding the heavy taxation of the people, and the enormous sums that are collected each year to be poured in the Federal Treasury, the public works and internal improvements of every character throughout the country have practically been denied by this Congress.

The most casual examination of this table makes comment practically unnecessary. It shows that the Army for each of the two years prior to the Spanish-American war cost a little over \$23,000,000, and but little more than \$46,000,000 for the two years covered by the Fifty-fourth Congress, while for the Army for each of the two years since that war, 1901 and 1902, it costs nearly \$115,000,000, or \$230,000,000 for the two years, exclusive of deficiencies that have been provided for in large sums out of appropriations made for expenses of the Spanish war during the Fifty-fifth Congress.

The Navy cost for the years 1897-1898, respectively, \$30,562,000 and \$33,000,000, or \$63,562,000 for the two years, while for the years 1901 and 1902 these appropriations amount to \$65,140,000 and \$78,653,000, respectively, or nearly \$144,000,000 for the two years.

For the payment of pensions the appropriations show an average annual increase of nearly \$4,000,000 for the current and next fiscal year over the years 1897 and 1898, or nearly \$8,000,000 for the two years.

In a word, this table shows that the price to the people of the policy of this administration that has been thrust upon them by the Republican party is in round numbers \$400,000,000 within a period of two years, and the half that is contemplated has not yet been put in operation.

The ship subsidy measure, that has been deferred but not abandoned, will cost \$180,000,000 more, to say nothing of the lesser schemes that are proposed.

Comparison between the appropriations of the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-sixth Congresses.

Title of bill.	Fifty-fourth Congress.*		Fifty-sixth Congress.	
	Appropriations, 1897.	Appropriations, 1898.	Appropriations, 1901.	Appropriations, 1902.
Agriculture	\$3,255,532.00	\$3,182,902.00	\$4,023,500.00	\$4,578,400.00
Army	23,278,402.73	23,129,344.30	114,230,065.55	115,735,649.10
Diplomatic and consular	1,642,558.76	1,635,308.76	1,771,168.76	1,850,228.76
District of Columbia	5,900,319.48	6,186,991.06	7,577,369.31	8,504,969.94
Fortification	7,577,888.00	9,517,141.00	7,383,628.00	7,364,011.00
Indian	7,390,496.79	7,674,120.89	8,197,989.24	9,506,221.09
Legislative, etc	21,519,324.71	21,690,766.90	24,175,652.53	24,600,753.85
Military Academy	449,525.61	479,572.89	674,306.67	748,653.68
Navy	30,562,000.00	33,000,000.00	65,140,000.00	78,653,000.00
Pension	141,328,580.00	141,263,880.00	145,245,230.00	145,245,230.00

Comparison between the appropriations of the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-sixth Congresses—Continued.

Title of bill.	Fifty-fourth Congress.*		Fifty-sixth Congress.	
	Appropriations, 1897.	Appropriations, 1898.	Appropriations, 1901.	Appropriations, 1902.
Post-Office	\$92,571,564.22	\$95,065,338.75	\$113,658,238.75	\$123,782,688.75
River and harbor	12,659,550.00		560,000.00	
Sundry civil	83,096,710.19	53,611,783.38	65,319,915.45	62,553,108.21
Total	381,033,113.44	397,100,384.06	557,948,010.18	583,212,888.13
Deficiencies	15,341,911.07	10,557,417.34	15,888,330.61	14,340,574.94
Total	396,375,024.51	407,657,801.40	573,836,341.54	597,553,463.07
Miscellaneous	416,010.08	999,057.90	3,802,304.34	8,000,000.00
Total regular annual appropriations	396,791,034.57	408,656,859.30	577,438,642.88	605,553,463.07
Permanent annual appropriations	119,054,160.00	120,078,230.00	132,712,230.00	124,358,230.00
Grand total regular and permanent annual appropriations	515,845,194.57	528,735,079.30	710,150,862.88	729,911,693.07
Grand total appropriations by Congresses		1,044,580,273.67		1,440,032,545.95

* The Agricultural, Indian, sundry civil, and general deficiency bills failed to pass at the second session of the Fifty-fourth Congress, but the bills, substantially as sent to the President for approval, were enacted at the ensuing extra session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, and are considered, therefore, in the table as though enacted in the second session of the Fifty-fourth Congress, being for the fiscal year 1898.

**Monument to Prison-Ship Martyrs at Fort Greene, New York—
Battle of New Orleans and Chalmette Monument.**

SPEECH

OF

HON. ADOLPH MEYER,

OF LOUISIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 27, 1901.

On the joint resolution (S. R. 152) in relation to monument to prison-ship martyrs at Fort Greene, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to express my cordial sympathy with the joint resolution (S. R. 152) to provide for a monument in honor of the martyrs who perished on the British prison ships in New York Harbor during the Revolutionary war. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] deserves our thanks for pressing this matter upon the attention of Congress.

The story of this sad drama is briefly but fitly told in the pending joint resolution. Unfortunately we do not have a full record of the names of those prisoners who perished on these pest ships of England. It is well known, however, that both the army of the colonies and the colonial navy were represented in that array of captives, and that every one of the thirteen States, from Massachusetts to Georgia, furnished its quota to the long list of sufferers. A few years ago the patriotic society of Old Brooklynites published the names of 8,000 of the prisoners who were confined on board the British prison ship *Jersey* during a part only of the Revolutionary war. This pamphlet says:

After diligent research among the records of the British war department, access to which was kindly permitted by Her Majesty's Government, this is all that can be found, and these are from the records of this one ship only. No record of the names of any of the prisoners of the prison ships *Scorpion*, *John*, *Stromboli*, *Falmouth*, *Hunter*, *Prince of Wales*, and *Transport* can be found, though their log books make very frequent mention of prisoners having been received on board. The list here presented is, therefore, but a small portion of those of our fellow-citizens who were confined on board these floating Golgothas. Nor is it possible to designate which of those names died on board, but authentic history within the memory of the parents of many now living proves that the number that died and were buried on our shores, and over whose remains we now desire to erect a monument worthy of these patriots, numbered more than 12,000!

The joint resolution, which is probably drawn up upon fuller investigation, recites that nearly 20,000 patriot soldiers and sailors of the colonial forces "perished upon those British prison ships in New York harbor from neglect, privation, and disease incident to their imprisonment, as many as 11,000 having died upon a single hulk."

History informs us that, forced by the strategy of Washington to evacuate Boston, the British General Howe, early in July, 1776, made a movement to capture the city of New York. With a force of 30,000 men, thoroughly equipped, opposed to a badly clothed

and equipped force of only half that number under Washington, the British defeated Washington on Long Island, taking 1,100 prisoners, and by other movements compelled the surrender of New York and the adjacent territory. They captured Fort Washington in November following, taking a large additional number of prisoners. They thus held New York City, Brooklyn, and all the adjacent territory, including Long Island. They held on to New York City till November, 1783.

I mention these well-known facts to enable us to form a just judgment upon the cruelty and barbarity of the British in their mode of confining and treating the great numbers of American prisoners who during the war fell into their hands. Holding this territory—this port of New York and its vicinity—securely, and having full command of the sea, it was an easy matter for them to have provided a camp for these prisoners of war on shore, with abundant shelter, pure air, clothing, food, surgeons, and medicines. A single regiment of their then large garrison located in New York would have sufficed to guard these prisoners and render resistance, rescue, or escape alike hopeless and impossible. If they did not do this act of humanity at the outset, whether from neglect or from lack of forethought, it was their imperative duty to have provided such a camp as soon as pestilence began to do its steady and dreadful work upon these unfortunate prisoners.

For seven long and weary years this work of horrible cruelty went on. There was no pity, no mercy shown. The conduct of the British authorities must be judged by the fact that this suffering continued from year to year under their own eyes and that they could easily have remedied it all, and yet they would not stir a finger.

What a record of noble, patriotic endurance on the one side and of fiendish cruelty and savagery on the other! All the while these brave men were plied with promises and suggestions to purchase freedom and life by taking the oath of allegiance to the Crown and enlisting in the service of the enemy. The soldier who faces death in battle has the excitement of the combat to fire his soul, the hope of honor and reward, the love and admiration of his family and friends, if he survives.

The patriot who is ready to sacrifice his home and property for a grand cause may hope to rebuild his shattered fortunes. The soldiers, half clad, who marched and camped in winter on frozen ground, often without shoes or blankets, the heroes who stood by the cause and who suffered at Valley Forge all through that dreadful winter, that stands out in history as a landmark of devoted duty, may well merit our praise, gratitude, and veneration. But can any of these be compared to the prisoners who calmly faced a slow, lingering, but almost certain death by pestilence rather than abandon their country's cause?

It is hard to conceive of the persistent cruelty of the British officers on this occasion, but it was only doing on a large scale what was done all over the land in detail. At the time this infamy began at New York City, Virginia and South Carolina had not been invaded. The hoofs of Tarleton's dragoons had not pressed our Southern soil. But Virginia's turn was soon to come, and come it did. Houses are sometimes burned in war by accident or by a few marauders and stragglers, but the British fleet that ascended the Potomac River burned the mansions of patriots right and left with a studied, careful malice.

In South Carolina, as has been eloquently said by one of her sons whose patriot ancestor had been compelled to suffer an ignominious death by the enemy—

The whole State, from the mountains to the sea, was overrun by an overwhelming force of the enemy. The fruits of industry perished on the spot where they were produced or were consumed by the foe. The plains of Carolina drank up the most precious blood of her citizens; black and smoking ruins marked the places which had been habitations of her children. Driven from their homes into the gloomy and almost impenetrable swamps, even there the spirit of liberty survived, and South Carolina, sustained by the examples of her Samters and her Marlons, proved by her conduct that, though her soil might be overrun, the spirit of her people was invincible.

Even the North American Indian was employed by England to lend new horrors to the combat, drawing down the eloquent rebuke of the immortal Chatham. All over the land, save in some portions of New England near New York, this terrible struggle went on from year to year. A gifted writer, Joseph G. Baldwin, of Alabama, in a few vivid words, tells the story of the struggle:

Great and unexpected reverses; sad defections; the weak vessels, once trusted brothers, falling off; miserable rivalries, even in the face of danger; bickerings, envy, insubordination in camp; disease, want of munitions of war, and of food, clothing, and shelter; the hope long and still deferred; the flag almost fainting in the breeze; the country deserted in all its busy avocations under a thick cloud of gloomy and of dreary silence; the forays of domestic enemies; the dwellings of the patriots blazing at midnight; the path ambushed by day; the dark deeds, too horrible for description, of the savages on the frontiers; the church closed or become the rendezvous of reveling soldiers; the schoolhouse on the hill deserted and the windows broken in; the sudden incursion of hostile cavalry into peaceable neighborhoods, scattering the women and children from the houses the marauders pillaged; the plow stopped in the furrow and the dilapidated farm overgrown with briars; the towns and villages depopulated and in ruins, and the streets of cities deserted, or only exhibiting here and there, under some creaking sign, a little knot of busy idlers discussing the last news from headquarters.

There remains only one thing to add to the somber but true tints of this picture, and that is the black spot of thousands of brave, lofty men dying on the British prison and pest ships in the harbor of New York, the headquarters of British power in North America.

All honor, therefore, I say, to the Tammany Society of the city in New York who, in 1808, collected the bones of those deceased heroes and martyrs, then lying exposed on the beach, and had them buried with all honor and fitting ceremony in the city of Brooklyn. Honor again, I say, to the park commission of Brooklyn, who, at a later period, prepared with great care and expense a permanent tomb for the reception of the remains of our heroic dead on the historic ground of Fort Greene, overlooking the scene of their sufferings and death.

I am very glad to know that the legislature of New York and the authorities of the cities of New York and Brooklyn have steadily shown a proper zeal and solicitude for building a monument to honor these men, and to show that republics are not ungrateful. It is not true that nothing has been done by New York but to appeal to the Federal Government. Thousands of dollars have already been collected for this monument, and laws have been passed by the State and municipality of New York to provide for further contributions.

The bill expressly stipulates that the sum of \$100,000 is appropriated on the part of the United States for this monument, but nothing of this sum is to be expended until \$100,000 shall have been raised by private subscription and by the authorities of the city and State of New York. New York goes hand in hand with you in this noble act. Her acts in the past to rescue the bones of these men from dishonor is an honorable page of her history. It is a reproach to your indifference. The much-abused Tammany Society of New York City has been faithful to its honorable traditions.

Suppose, however, it were true, as falsely alleged, that the people and authorities of this locality had done nothing but call your attention to this unfulfilled duty; ought you to hesitate? The soldiers and sailors who perished there, did they come from New York alone or from all of the thirteen colonies? They were the sons of our America—of all our political domain, of every colony, State, and neighborhood. The blood that coursed through their veins is the same as that of hundreds of thousands of our people to-day all over this broad land. Many a family cherishes this honorable record of a relative who perished there in a British prison ship.

Have you any nobler act or event in all your history than this? Can it be surpassed or even matched in ancient or modern story? Is it not the duty and the privilege of every State of this Union to join in this act of pious veneration? Is there any State so cold and so callous as to be reluctant or indifferent? Will you not do some one thing in this age of commercialism and cold, sordid calculation and greed that shall show to the world that the purse of the country's payers can be opened as freely to honor those who fought and died for your freedom as to benefit those who consider bounties by the million a small reward for party service?

Sir, I hope that members on the other side of the House will not look coldly on this proposition because an old Democratic society of New York, the Tammany Society, took the initiative in the work of rescuing the remains of these patriots thus lying exposed and had them fitly buried and honored. The Tammany Society, cherishing a strong feeling of indignation toward England on account of her atrocities in the Revolutionary war and her repeated insults and injuries to our flag, this going on until it culminated finally in the war of 1812, naturally took the lead in this matter. They deserve great honor for their action.

But this ought not to be in any degree a party question, and I should be very sorry to see anything approaching a party division on this question. You appropriate money freely by the million for fairs and expositions; you tax the people over a hundred millions every year for a needless and unprofitable war; you have crowded the capital with monuments to those whose only title to distinction is that of service in an unfortunate civil strife, and surely you will not, you can not, refuse this small appropriation to honor these heroes who suffered a daily torture that this country might be free, and who thus gave you an example of rare personal unselfishness and exalted patriotism which fortunately you have never had the opportunity to imitate, but which will, I hope, be an incentive to the highest public virtue for us and those who come after us for all time that the Republic shall endure.

BATTLE OF NEW ORLEANS—THE CHALMETTE MONUMENT.

Mr. Speaker, it will ere long be my duty—and a most pleasant duty—in behalf of the State of Louisiana, to press upon the attention of Congress the erection of a monument in honor of the signal victory achieved by the American arms, under the leadership of the immortal Jackson, upon the plains of Chalmette, near the city of New Orleans, on the 8th of January, 1815. Jackson won many victories in peace and in war, but great as was his military genius and civic capacity the student of history will find in his

defense of Louisiana, beginning with his arrival on the 1st of December, 1814, to the final repulse and collapse of the British invasion, the highest proofs of a military capacity which will always give him rank among the great captains of the world. His very presence was an inspiration. Doubt, fear, discord, insubordination vanished before his presence and resistless energy. He was confronted by a superior force of veterans, schooled by the great Duke of Wellington in the Peninsular Campaigns, the heroes of Badajoz, Ciudad Rodrigo, Vitoria, and many bloody combats, and led by commanders who knew not what it was to fear any obstacle or danger.

They had the best arms, the highest equipment, perfect discipline, an overwhelming naval force. Jackson had a smaller army of comparatively raw troops, with many unskilled and inexperienced officers, soldiers badly armed, half disciplined, not accustomed to act together, and who received their principal instruction in arms in this very campaign. Among the defenders were released convicts and Lafitte's pirates—only the day before outlawed and proscribed—and other incongruous elements, but all welded together into one resistless mass by the fire of Jackson's patriotism. The city was greatly exposed. There were many points of attack, and it was difficult to anticipate at what point the enemy's blow would be struck. As it was, New Orleans was very nearly surprised. A large British force was landed very near the city before Jackson, with all his vigilance, knew of their coming. His preparations, however, were promptly made, and he attacked them that very night in their works. He swore in his mighty wrath that they should not sleep on the soil of Louisiana, and faithfully did he keep his word. He attacked them incessantly until the day of final assault by Pakenham, when the flower of Britain's chivalry went down before the deadly aim of the riflemen of Tennessee and the hunters of Kentucky. After that overwhelming, crushing repulse the city of New Orleans and the Province of Louisiana were safe.

To appreciate the grandeur of this victory we must remember that it came at the close of a war in which success and defeat had quickly followed each other. On the sea, indeed, our arms were generally victorious. British frigates for the first time almost in history were compelled to strike their colors. Still, we had painful reverses, too, on the water. On the land our repeated attempts to invade and overrun Canada had all been repulsed. No impression had been made in that quarter. There had been successes and reverses, and among the latter one shameful capitulation by an American commander. We had, indeed, the glory of Scott and of Macomb to console us, but Canada defied our arms and most energetic endeavors. The Indians had cooperated with the enemy and had laid waste our exposed Northwestern frontier. A British force had landed on the Patuxent River, in Maryland, not many miles from this city of Washington, had marched across the country to Bladensburg, routed the American Army, and then had marched unopposed to our seat of government, burning our Capitol, the President's Mansion, and other public buildings, while the President and his Cabinet had to flee before them.

Treason and disaffection were rearing their front at the Hartford Convention, and the war, begun with so much spirit and enthusiasm, was pressing hardly upon our resources as a people.

It was at this trying hour that the victory of New Orleans came to gladden the hearts of patriots and to wipe out the disgrace of Hull's surrender and the occupation of our capital by a hostile force.

It may be said that a treaty of peace had already been signed before Jackson won his famous victory, and that it was therefore unimportant. This would be a shallow view to take of the subject. Suppose Pakenham had defeated Jackson and overrun the Territory of Louisiana, would Great Britain have ever surrendered it? Our experience of her systematic bad faith in not carrying out the treaty of peace in 1783 and of her gross repudiation of the treaty of Amiens made with Napoleon, and of many breaches of treaty engagements by England and other nations, ought to admonish us that if Louisiana had ever been conquered by England its prompt restoration to the United States would have been very doubtful, and possibly not effected without prolonged hostilities. But apart from this, I hold that the victory of New Orleans served to develop the national character, and by its example to admonish all foreign governments of the exceeding and inherent strength of governments founded on free institutions.

The French Revolution was eventually put down, it is true, but it has been a lesson to tyrants ever since. The victory at New Orleans showed that America could defend herself without a great standing army, and that successful invasion was perfectly hopeless. To erect a monument, then, is an appropriate duty. It is not a mere local bounty or compliment, for the whole Mississippi Valley—Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi especially—shared in the glory of the defense. It belongs to the nation as a victory second only to Yorktown in its effect, and with all the glory belonging to our own people, our own soldiers, and the mighty leader of our brave defenders.

War-Revenue Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,
OF NEW YORK.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 28, 1901,

On the conference report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12394) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898, and to reduce taxation thereunder.

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The war-tax-reduction bill, as agreed to by the conferees on the part of the Senate and House, seems to me to be improvident as a measure of fiscal policy. This Congress by its extravagance in appropriations has far exceeded the revenue estimates of the Secretary of the Treasury, and yet by this act the Congress proposes to reduce the revenues many millions beyond the Secretary's recommendations. Are we not guilty of a reckless disregard of orderly financial methods, and are we giving due consideration to the business interests of the country, which are ever sensitive to changes in Treasury conditions.

I fear it is a mistake at this time to reduce materially the gross revenues at all, nor would such reduction be demanded by public sentiment with the true conditions known.

Some of the stamp taxes imposed by the act of 1898 have proved an annoyance to the public. Any tax is an annoyance. Many persons are so constituted that they are irritated by the necessity of paying a butcher's or a grocer's bill—much more by the sterner obligations to the tax man. But it is a fundamental truth that in a free country the taxes that annoy most are the safest. When the citizen feels his taxes, when he has positive knowledge of the time, manner, and amount of his contributions for the support of his Government, he is likely to pay closer attention to the conduct of the public servants who spend his money, and to take effective means to restrain their pervading tendency to extravagance. If our revenue were raised entirely by direct taxation, by taxes so imposed that the contributor could figure up at the end of the year the exact amount of his contribution, we should be pretty sure to see a realization of the old-fashioned doctrine of Samuel J. Tilden, that the revenues should be limited to the necessities of the Government, economically administered. It is safer for the taxpayer to pay for and to endure without complaint the slight annoyance of licking and affixing internal-revenue stamps to his promissory notes and transfers than to trust himself to the concealments of a system of indirect taxes.

Mr. Speaker, when the purchaser of merchandise gives his check in payment he knows that he has contributed 2 cents to the expense of the Government—no more, no less. But algebra and logarithms would be vainly invoked to tell him how much he had been taxed by the customs duties levied on the goods he had bought. The stamp on his bank check is a visible and measured expenditure. He may not know at all that in paying for his goods he pays a duty of from 30 to 200 per cent. He has, moreover, no way of finding out how much the manufacturer has added to the cost of domestic goods under the privilege and protection of a section of the tariff drawn by himself and adopted by Congress at his request. Only one hand, his own, visits the consumer's pocket for the money that pays the stamp tax. When the consumer puts his hand in his pocket for the money to pay a customs duty, side by side with his own, and often reaching deeper and abstracting more, goes the prehensile paw of the trust, the Government's protected favorite, the beneficiary of bounties forced from the people by the Dingley tariff.

We devote considerable time talking about the interests and welfare of the plain people. How can we justify the remission of \$7,000,000 of taxation by the removal of the stamp tax on bank checks, paid by persons sufficiently well off to have bank accounts, and of which nobody should complain, while retaining the tariff duties on iron and steel, an industry that now commands the markets of the world and in which a combination has just been formed with over \$1,000,000,000 of share and loan capital?

I have favored a revision of the internal-revenue-tax law on proper lines. Such a revision might have been undertaken with propriety. Some of the levies under the existing law were not only annoying, but unproductive. They should be struck off. But it is senseless to remit needed taxes, forty millions at a time, and put embarrassment in the way of a much wiser measure of revenue reform for which the time is now almost ripe, particularly when Congress is trusting to luck to avoid a deficit for the next fiscal

year and the Government is in gross danger of living beyond its means through legislative extravagance.

This conference report is signed both by the majority and by the minority members, from which circumstance it would appear that the leaders on the Democratic as well as those on the Republican side of the House are satisfied with the measure as reported. I can not but attribute this unanimity of sentiment to different motives and am so bold as to doubt whether this harmonious frame of mind was reached through the same channels of reason. Undoubtedly our Republican friends believe a tax-reduction bill will prove popular, and so it will with those of our people who consider the matter superficially, giving little heed to the future, as well as with those whom the bill favors especially. On this side of the House I will venture the surmise that a prospective deficit in our National Treasury, caused by extravagant appropriations, the heavy expense of our war in the Philippines, and our expedition into China, will not be viewed with disfavor, and it may be argued that such a state must operate to the disadvantage of the Republican party and to the benefit of the Democratic party. If I have diagnosed the case correctly, I see little to the credit of either of the parties, and certainly no good to the country.

General Deficiency Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. C. ADAMSON,
OF GEORGIA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 20, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 14236) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. ADAMSON said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will not take time to make any remarks myself on the pending question, but I have a letter from a prominent and well-informed gentleman in the district I represent, written to me on the subject of hazing, which I will use as my remarks. It is as follows:

COLUMBUS, GA., January 25, 1901.

Hon. W. C. ADAMSON, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your esteemed favor of 22d in regard to the West-point Academy investigation, I believe that I fully voice the sentiment of our community in asserting that the recent disgraceful conditions developed by the Congressional committee would make the Academy appear an institution for the education and training of bullies and cowards, rather than gentlemen and soldiers, did we not fully recognize and appreciate the fact that there are even now many notable exceptions among the cadets to the unseemly practices, and that from this Academy have been graduated some of the noblest types of American manhood, whose example and reputation reflect honor upon our country and challenge the admiration of the world.

As at present constituted and conducted, it menaces the integrity and dignity of our civil institutions by encouraging the worst features of an autocracy, in which a military aristocracy is being fostered to overawe and dominate the people to whose countenance and generosity the Academy owes its existence.

The creature has outgrown its creators, as evidenced by the defiance of these beardless cadets before the Congressional committee, and their commandant has the temerity to assert that a pernicious and cowardly system of outrage, assault, and personal indignity "can not be wholly controlled or prevented" in an academy which is dependent upon the bounty of the people and the will of the Government! If, as seems to be the consensus of opinion, the miscreants who have perpetrated these humiliating abuses, which have attained to the flagrancy and moral turpitude of actual crime in several instances, should be punished and expelled, what then should be done with those officials at the head of this United States Academy who, knowing of these abuses, permitted them to be possible? They should be promptly removed, and officers placed in command who have both the capacity and disposition to enforce decency and discipline.

No temporizing or halfway measures will satisfy the people; the Academy should be reorganized from the top.

Under imperial and despotic systems existing in Europe militarism pervades, controls, and stifles the very atmosphere of civil life. The masses are contemptuously overridden and thrust to the wall. With a continuance of the influences now being fostered at Westpoint, such is the apparent destiny of our own Republic, and unless the viper is crushed now and forever we shall soon feel the fangs of these little military bullies and autocrats, nurtured in the bosom of the people, grown great and insolent at their expense.

We have had already a slight experience during our late war with Spain of the domineering nature of militarism, "the insolence of office, and the spurns that patient merit of the unworthy takes."

We trust that such a bill will be brought forward and enacted for the regulation of the Academy as will make its attendants realize that they are the servants, not the aristocratic masters, of the people; that the sword shall be forever subordinate to the law in this Republic; that manly, brave, just officers shall command its armies; gentlemen in the sense of those who are tender and considerate of the feelings of others, and not such brutal and petty natures as have been in the recent past developed and tolerated at the West-point Academy.

I have the highest consideration for discipline and for soldierly qualities, for their necessity and enforcement; I appreciate also and make full allowance for the exuberance of youth, but I can see no necessary connection between this natural characteristic and the belittling meanness that oppresses and abuses the weak as has been demonstrated conclusively by the testimony before this Congressional committee. I indulge the hope that the late "con-

cessions" of the cadets to an overwhelming sense of their shame and protest of public indignation, however commendable such concession may be (and which binds nobody but the present classes), will not delay or prevent the enactment of such stringent laws and regulations by Congress as will enforce obedience, self-respect, and propriety of conduct, for all time to come, from those who receive the beneficence of our people and Government and who should be exemplars alike of the true soldier and gentleman. I write feelingly upon this subject, as one mortified and humiliated at this stain upon the heretofore unsullied character of American manhood; and I write, also, as one of the people, who has given the best years of his youth as a soldier freely in the active service of his country, and who feels sensibly the humiliating result of the present investigation.

I am, dear sir,

Very cordially, yours,

LIONEL C. LEVY.

The Subsidy Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,
OF OHIO.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 20, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 14018) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes.

Mr. GROSVENOR said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I avail myself of the opportunity given by the general order of the House on yesterday to authorize general debate upon the pending measure to make reply very briefly to some remarks made by the able gentleman representing one of the Massachusetts districts (I refer to Mr. THAYER), which were made in a like general debate upon an appropriation bill. That speech of the gentleman was made in reply, apparently, to a speech made by Senator FRYE in the Senate of the United States. I had intended when the occurrence took place to take up the speech of Senator FRYE and as far as it was possible analyze it and discuss it with reference to the criticism by the gentleman from Massachusetts, but when I began to consider the subject I, of course, at once found myself in collision with the rules of the House and the general parliamentary law of the country, and that it would not only not be competent but highly improper for me to refer to any discussion had in the Senate upon this or any other bill.

This is a rule so old and so well established that I dared not impinge upon it. I cite the authorities which have made it impossible that I shall venture into this field. It has been left for the gentleman from Massachusetts, in his first formal speech in the House of Representatives, to hold up an argument of a member of the Senate and reply to it seriatim, to call the Senator by name, and to refer to the speech of a Senator in the other branch of the legislative body.

It is a breach of order to refer in debate to proceedings in the other House, and it is particularly the duty of the Speaker to prevent such expressions. (Jefferson's Manual, Section XVII, p. 157; Third session Fifty-fifth Congress, RECORD, pp. 2069, 2085; Appendix, pp. 33, 30.)

References in the nature of criticisms of the other body or comments upon it have been repressed with strictness.

I cite half a dozen decisions, reference to which is had on page 432 of the Manual and Digest.

It is not in order in debate to refer to a Senator in terms or criticize him personally. (First session Fifty-second Congress, Journal, p. 87; RECORD, p. 1703.)

Since I have been a member of the House this rule has been so rigidly enforced that I dare not trench upon it, and hence will be unable to draw that clear line of distinction which I should have been glad to have drawn between the speech of Senator FRYE and the construction given to it by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

In the course of his remarks the gentleman from Massachusetts refers to the speech to which he is replying, using language like this:

Senator FRYE is of the opinion that not more than, etc.

Now, assuming, as Senator FRYE suggests, etc.

It is stated by Senator FRYE that we can not man and run our boats, etc.

Senator FRYE's statement is startling as it appears on paper, etc.

These are some of the points in Senator FRYE's speech that I should have been delighted to refer to if I could have had the privilege and opportunity of making reference thereto, but I bow willingly to the rules of the House and the general law of parliamentary procedure.

I desire to respond briefly to some of the statements made by the member from Massachusetts [Mr. THAYER] in the course of his remarks upon the ship-subsidy bill on Tuesday last.

First. As to the objection of the gentleman to the provisions of the bill for the admission to American registry, under certain limitations, of foreign tonnage owned to the extent of at least a majority interest by American citizens, I would say that this feature

of the bill has, from its very inception, been the subject of constant discussion and most thoughtful consideration on the part of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

It was conclusively demonstrated at the hearings upon the subsidy bill held by our committee that the average cost of ships built in this country has been about 25 per cent greater than the average cost of similar ships built in Great Britain, and this was shown to be as true of the ships built by that eminent shipbuilder, Mr. Charles H. Cramp, notwithstanding his statements quoted by the member from Massachusetts as to those built in other American shipyards.

It was also conclusively demonstrated that the average cost of operation of American ships has been about 33½ per cent greater than the average cost of operation of similar British ships in the same lines of trade.

These facts were submitted, not only to prove the impossibility of operating American ships in foreign trade in competition with foreign ships without sufficient Government aid to equalize the differences noted, but also to show why such American citizens as wished to engage in foreign trade were compelled to invest their capital in ships built abroad and operated under foreign flags.

It was shown that some American citizens had so invested their capital, and these citizens asked that a fair measure of protection be given them under the provisions of the bill under contemplation for the upbuilding of an American merchant marine. They argued that unless they were given such protection they would be compelled, in order to save their capital already invested, to join with the foreign-owned steamship lines, not only in opposing the bill, but also the establishment and development of American lines under the bill.

In consideration of the facts that it seemed only fair to give these American citizens some protection and that by securing their support we would also secure, not only the immediate possession of some valuable lines of trade already well equipped with modern tonnage, but also the benefit of the practical experience and peculiar ability of these men to help us develop new lines of trade as fast as American vessels could be obtained, our committee felt that the claims of these citizens were entitled to very serious consideration.

As the discussion proceeded it soon became apparent that the United States as a whole would benefit materially by the admission of this foreign-built tonnage, because it was proposed to give the admitted tonnage only half the compensation designed for American-built tonnage and compel the owners of the admitted tonnage to build in this country new tonnage equivalent to that to be admitted before permitting them to receive any subsidy upon the latter, the result of this, of course, being that for every 100 tons of foreign-built tonnage admitted 100 tons of new tonnage would be built in this country, and the 200 tons combined would receive only 75 per cent of the subsidy that 200 tons would receive if it were all built in this country.

This seemed such a good thing for the nation as a whole that some argued that the privilege of bringing in foreign-built tonnage ought not to be confined to those American citizens whose capital was already invested in such tonnage, but should be extended, for a period of time at least, to any citizen who might desire to make similar investments.

At this point, however, the shipbuilders of the country appeared and showed that perhaps the most important object of the bill should be, by creating a constant and increasing demand for American-built ships, to so develop the shipbuilding industry in this country as to eventually enable that industry to produce ships here as cheaply as they can be produced in Great Britain.

The shipbuilders argued that this result could not possibly be attained unless the subsidy were confined, as far as possible, to American-built ships. They did concede, however, that it would be fair and also good policy to extend to American citizens whose capital was already invested in foreign-built ships just sufficient protection for such ships to secure their cooperation and assistance in the proposed upbuilding of the American merchant marine.

The provisions of the bill for the admission of foreign tonnage have, therefore, been developed as a compromise between the American citizens whose capital was already invested in foreign ships and the American shipbuilders; and I desire to state that with a view of bringing this compromise to a final conclusion amendments are now under consideration which will receive my support, and which, if adopted, will limit the foreign tonnage to be admitted to just about 200,000 tons, which foreign tonnage, at the full rates of compensation provided for in the bill, would not earn, under the most favorable conditions, over \$1,500,000 per annum.

Second. As to the suggestion made by the member from Massachusetts, that the stock of the steamship companies which will receive the subsidy may hereafter be acquired by foreigners, I would say that it is the purpose of the bill to make the operation of American vessels in foreign trade profitable, so as to attract capital to the business, and if this object is attained the stock of

these steamship companies is no more likely to be sold to foreigners than the stock of any other American industrial enterprises which have been made profitable by protective legislation. It might as well be argued that we should not protect any industries in this country for fear the stock of corporations engaged in such industries might become valuable and foreigners might bid for it.

Our steamship lines engaged in coastwise trade have received absolute protection from the beginning of our history, but there is nothing to prevent foreigners from buying the stock of the corporations that own these lines if the American stockholders were disposed to sell. The lines are profitable, however, and American stockholders are not disposed to sell, and I do not believe a single share of stock of an American coastwise steamship company is owned by a foreigner to-day.

In any case, whether the stock be owned by Americans or by foreigners, the ships and the lines will be American. They will be subject to the call of our Government at any time if needed, and they will carry our products to foreign markets under the protection of our own flag, thus relieving this country from the danger that now daily confronts it of being cut off from foreign markets by any European war that might involve any of the great maritime nations on the ships of which we are now utterly dependent for the delivery of our goods abroad, where we must dispose of our surpluses.

Third. The gentleman from Massachusetts laid considerable stress upon the point that the men who were our chief advisers in the drafting of the bill were themselves interested in shipping.

The answer to this criticism is so obvious that it seems hardly necessary to mention it.

To whom would we go for advice and assistance in the drafting of a measure of such a technical character if not to the men whose practical experience has made their advice upon this subject valuable? Could we draft a Navy bill without consulting the experts of the Navy Department, or could we draft an Army bill without consulting the experts of the War Department? How, then, could we draft a shipping bill without consulting the experts in shipping matters?

Fourth. The gentleman from Massachusetts next suggested that if it be true that, owing to the higher rate of wages that must be paid in American shipyards and upon American ships, it is impossible for ships built and operated under the American flag to compete with foreign ships without Government aid, then the Government, instead of subsidizing American ships to make up the difference and put them on terms of equality with foreign ships, should subsidize American laborers and American sailors, so as to induce the former to work in American shipyards and the latter to serve on American ships at foreign rates of wages.

This proposition has the merit of novelty at least.

If at the end of each week the American shipbuilder could make up his payroll at the English rates of wages and the United States Government would pay the men whatever additional amounts it might be necessary to pay them in order to induce them to work, then the shipbuilder could undoubtedly produce ships in this country as cheaply as they could be produced abroad; and if the American shipowner could make up his payroll at the English rates of wages, and the United States Government would pay the crews whatever additional amounts might be necessary to induce them to work, the American shipowner could undoubtedly operate American ships as cheaply as foreign ships and the same result—to that extent, at least—would be accomplished under such a scheme as under the subsidy bill.

Of course, so long as the laborer and the sailor receive the wages that they demand under the American flag, both ashore and afloat, they do not care whether the wages are paid wholly by the shipbuilder and shipowner, or partly by the shipbuilder and shipowner and partly by the Government, nor would the shipbuilder and shipowner care so long as they could get laborers and sailors as cheaply as their foreign competitors can get them.

I must admit, however, that the drafting of a measure which would accomplish these results, with due regard to the protection of the interests of the United States Government, and without involving that Government in an infinitely greater expenditure of money than that contemplated in the subsidy bill, appears to me to be beyond my powers, and until the gentleman from Massachusetts has proven the contrary I shall feel warranted in believing that such a task would be beyond even his powers.

Fifth. In reference to the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, that the ships created and sustained by the bill would not, for the next ten years, be able to carry more than one-eighth of the exports and imports of this country, I would say that my understanding is that the bill will create, within a very few years, an American merchant marine available for foreign trade aggregating about 2,000,000 of tons gross register, and that to carry all the exports of this country would require a fleet aggregating about 8,000,000 of tons gross register. Of course, our imports being so much lighter than our exports, the same fleet could much more than carry all our imports. Therefore, as will

appear from these figures, the effect of the bill within a very few years will be to enable us to carry at least a quarter of our exports and a much larger proportion of our imports under our own flag. I, personally, have no doubt that by that time the cost of production of ships in this country will have been so materially reduced by the increased demand that our merchant marine will continue to expand, even though such expansion will necessarily involve a pro rata reduction of the subsidy.

As to the reduction in freight rates, that will be brought about by the incursion of these 2,000,000 of tons of American shipping into the foreign trade. That, of course, is largely a matter of conjecture; but, with all deference to the opinion expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I must say I look for a considerable reduction, and in any case the competition must necessarily be such as to compel the carrying of our goods, whether by our own ships or by foreign ships, at the lowest rates at which they can be profitably carried.

Sixth. The gentleman from Massachusetts made several statements about the growth and condition of the merchant marines of foreign nations, and drew inferences from his statements which do not appear to be warranted by the facts.

It must be remembered that of all maritime nations the United States is the only one that is at a disadvantage as compared with all the rest, not only as regards the original cost of the ship, but also as regards the cost of maintenance and the cost of operation of the ship. Some other maritime nations are at disadvantages as compared with other maritime nations in respect to one, or possibly two, of these elements of cost, but no other nation except the United States is at a disadvantage as regards all three.

The extraordinary development in the merchant shipping of Norway is due to the fact that Norway possesses an advantage in the cost of operation of ships which, up to the present time, has more than counterbalanced all other advantages possessed by any other maritime nation over her.

The success of Norway, therefore, proves nothing in regard to the solution of the difficulty that confronts us.

The gentleman from Massachusetts stated that "in Germany the increase in tonnage, which existed before the adoption of the subsidy system, did not continue after bounties were paid," by which statement he showed an extraordinary lack of information upon the subject.

Germany began paying subsidies in 1886, in which year her steam tonnage amounted to 601,975 tons. In 1900 her tonnage amounted to 2,169,029 tons. In the fourteen years prior to the beginning of the payment of subsidies in 1886 the German merchant marine had increased only 447,930 tons. In the fourteen years following the beginning of the payment of subsidies, to wit, from 1886 to 1900, the German merchant marine increased 1,567,054 tons. In other words, the increase was three and one-half times greater under the subsidy than without the subsidy.

I fear the statement of the gentleman from New England, that less than 3 per cent of the tonnage of Great Britain receives subsidy, is also founded on incorrect information. I can not myself state just what percentage of the tonnage of Great Britain does receive subsidy, but I know that 80 per cent of the steamers of the world of 14 knots speed and over are subsidized, and as Great Britain owns a very large proportion of these steamers, and as, by reason of their size, they constitute a very large proportion of her tonnage, I am sure they must amount to far more than 3 per cent of the total; but in any case, as I have already stated, it is not necessary for Great Britain to pay subsidies except in special cases, because she enjoys the advantage of being able to build ships cheaper than any other nation in the world and to operate them cheaper than many other nations, so that, even if it were true that only 3 per cent of the tonnage of Great Britain is subsidized, that would prove nothing as to the remedy for our trouble.

The statement that the Hamburg-American Line has never had any subsidy, while possibly technically true, is practically the reverse. No attempt is made to deny that the North German Lloyd Steamship Company receives very large subsidies from the German Government, and it is perfectly well understood in shipping circles that the North German Lloyd and the Hamburg-American Packet companies divide their business on such terms that the latter receives a fair share of the benefits accorded the former.

The Hamburg-American Company's report for 1893 in part says

We have closed a contract for several years with the administration of the Norddeutscher Lloyd by which we in common shall carry on, not only the lines between New York and the Mediterranean, but also the cabin traffic to and from Hamburg, Bremen, Southampton, as also the outgoing freight traffic; and have regulated the division of receipts, and thus set aside competition between our companies. That through this union the earning capacity of the two companies is greatly increased is certain, and there is no doubt that this union of the German companies gives a power which will be sufficient to keep competition within bounds and afford protection against all competitors.

This quotation not only shows the fallacy of the argument that the Hamburg-American Company is operated independently of Government aid, but also shows that in Germany the fact of two great companies practically monopolizing German shipping, in-

stead of being regarded with disfavor, is regarded as the best possible use of Germany's resources in the prosecution of that vigorous competition for a share of the world's carrying trade which has been one of the first considerations in Germany's political and commercial policy for some years past.

I do not say that we should follow exactly the same course, but I do say that in view of Germany's successes it is absurd for us to stand hesitating about the passage of a proper subsidy bill because some people fear that a few large interests may secure a large share of the subsidy.

Our committee has so drawn the bill that it is impossible for anyone to receive subsidy under it unless he performs the service required at least as cheaply as anyone else is willing to perform it, and that provision makes this subsidy bill the fairest, most democratic, and most advanced legislation that has ever been designed by this Government or any other government for a similar purpose.

I do not now and here intend to further answer the objections made to this measure. I recently read a long letter printed in one of the newspapers of Massachusetts, written, apparently, by one of the able men of that State, alleging some half dozen objections to the bill, some affirmative objections to the things in the bill and some negative objections because certain things were not in the bill, and I carefully read the measure as it pends in the House and in the Senate, and find that every one of the statements of the gentleman were erroneous as to the actual facts in the case.

The Late Alfred C. Harmer.

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. McCLEARY,

OF MINNESOTA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, December 8, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. ALFRED C. HARMER, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Pennsylvania.

"Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a distinguished public servant, the House, at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings, shall stand adjourned.

"Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

"Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased."

Mr. McCLEARY said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The man who for nearly thirty years held the confidence and affection of an intelligent Philadelphia constituency, as did General HARMER, has no need of eulogy from us.

Nevertheless, such exercises as these are eminently fitting and proper. It is well that when a man lays down the burden of great public duties that he has faithfully carried for many years in the general interest, his colleagues should suspend for a time the public service and do honor to the departed. It is due to the dead and well for the living. To the dead it is in the nature of a reward for faithful service; to the living it is an inspiration to continue "faithful to the end."

As Hawthorne teaches in his story of The Great Stone Face, we become like that which we habitually or frequently contemplate. How proper, then, that a useful and honorable life should at its close have for a time our respectful and sympathetic consideration. As Irving says: "The natural effect of sorrow over the dead is to refine and elevate the mind."

Mr. Speaker, when I first entered this body at the first session of the Fifty-third Congress, I was fortunate in being seated near General HARMER. He was early pointed out to me as one among those longest in service in the House. As such he was to us "new members" an object of interest and a subject of study.

He was so quiet and retiring that I thought for a while that he was reserved and proud. But ere long I discovered my mistake. I soon found that he was a man characterized by works rather than words, by kindly deeds rather than by protestations of regard.

I learned to go to him for counsel, and I always received it. I found him at all times gentle and generous, courtly and kindly, patient and patriotic—a man of conscience and of courage. What more can I say? What more could be said of anyone?

Those of his loved ones who are left behind are blessed by the fragrance of his memory. And they can surely find comfort in the words of Whittier—

Life is ever Lord of Death,
And Love can never lose its own.

Inland Waterway—Inland Waterway from Norfolk Harbor to Beaufort Inlet, North Carolina—This should constitute only one link in a complete chain of waterways from Boston Harbor to Beaufort Inlet, North Carolina.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN H. SMALL,

OF NORTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, March 4, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMALL said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The most important subject in connection with waterways under consideration by the National Government is the construction and maintenance of an interior waterway along our Atlantic coast. There is no project which will result more advantageously in the promotion of domestic commerce, because it will cheapen traffic rates and foster the interchange of commerce between all sections of our country.

The river and harbor bill contains an amendment proposed by the Senate, which is as follows:

"The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to appoint a board of engineers, to consist of not less than three and not more than five, and to be taken from either the active or retired list of engineers in the service of the United States, to consider the entire subject of a waterway of not less than 16 feet depth, from Norfolk Harbor, in the State of Virginia, to Beaufort Inlet, in the State of North Carolina, with instructions (first) to make surveys of all possible routes, if necessary, whether or not included in recent surveys made by Maj. James B. Quinn and Capt. E. W. Van C. Lucas and reported to Congress in Executive Document No. 202, Fifty-sixth Congress, second session, and (second) to submit a report with estimates and recommendations, and, in the event of a favorable recommendation, a description of the best route; such report to contain an estimate of the total cost of the construction of the route recommended for adoption, including the probable cost of the purchase and improvement to 16 feet depth of any private waterways that it may be to the interest of the United States to acquire and improve in connection with the above improvement. And said board when appointed is authorized to order such journeys for any or all of its members as may be necessary to investigate not only any or all possible parts of proposed route, but also the commercial interests of any port or ports liable to be affected by the establishment of the proposed waterway."

This amendment has been agreed to by the conference committee of the two Houses and will become a law if the bill passes, which at this time, I regret to say, appears improbable. In this connection I may be permitted to add that the opposition to the river and harbor bill is not based on meritorious grounds, but proceeds in part from the disappointment of those who sought to incorporate in it provisions for the inauguration of the project of irrigating arid lands in the West, and in part from those who, having encouraged lavish appropriations for various other objects, now seek at the end of the session to practice economy at the expense of our shipping and domestic commerce.

It was my privilege to introduce at the last session a bill for a partial survey of this waterway and the same was incorporated in the emergency river and harbor act of June 6, 1900, as follows:

Pasquotank River [North Carolina]: With the view of obtaining a navigable depth of 16 feet at mean low water from South Mills, on the Pasquotank River, thence down the Pasquotank River, through Albemarle Sound, Croatan Sound, Pamlico Sound, and Core Sound, to Beaufort Inlet, including also cost of procuring a navigable depth of 18 feet through Beaufort Inlet and 18 feet through Ocracoke Inlet, respectively.

The examination and survey of this waterway was made and report thereof submitted to the Fifty-sixth Congress, second session, Document No. 202. This report contains much interesting material, and I shall quote therefrom quite fully without at this time attempting to submit at length any comments of my own. The Chief of Engineers submitted that part of the prescribed route between South Mills and the 16-foot curve in Albemarle Sound to Maj. James B. Quinn, of the Norfolk, Va., office, and the remainder or the southern end of the prescribed route to Capt. E. W. Van C. Lucas, of the Wilmington, N. C., office. The report on the preliminary examination by Major Quinn contained this indorsement by Col. Peter C. Hains, division engineer:

In my opinion the opening of an inland waterway between the Northern and Southern States along the coast is highly desirable, both for commercial and military reasons. The entire waterway, however, should be under the control of the General Government. This would necessitate the purchase by the United States of the Dismal Swamp Canal, if the route herein referred to is adhered to.

The report of the preliminary examination by Captain Lucas contains an interesting statement of the advantages of this waterway, as follows:

The object of this proposed project is to obtain an inland waterway of 16 feet depth between Norfolk and either Ocracoke or Beaufort Inlet, south of Hatteras, principally for the use of seagoing barges passing between South Atlantic ports and points north of Chesapeake Bay. The arguments advanced may be summarized as follows:

1. Large transportation is the cheapest known method for bulky freights like coal, lumber, etc. Its use has, in a few years, reduced by 30 to 40 per

cent the rates on north-bound lumber from North Carolina sounds, and by over 75 per cent the rates on north-bound coal from Chesapeake Bay ports.

2. It can not be successfully used for South Atlantic ports, because of perils and delays incident to rounding Cape Hatteras.

3. The establishment of an inland water route between Norfolk and some inlet south of Hatteras, as Ocracoke or Beaufort, will render possible the use of seagoing barges between South Atlantic and Northern ports, with resulting benefits similar to those following their use north of Chesapeake Bay.

The commercial interests affected are very large. If the bulky commodities from the South Atlantic ports have the option of shipment by barge, the barge rate will determine the railroad rate, whether or not shipped by that route; consequently all such commodities, whether now shipped by water or by railroad, would be affected.

The ports affected include Wilmington, N. C.; Georgetown and Charleston, S. C.; Savannah and Brunswick, Ga.; Fernandina and Jacksonville, Fla., and many minor points; but a determination of quantities and values would involve a personal investigation at the various points named, which is not practicable in the time available for preparation of this report.

A survey for the desired 16-foot inland waterway south of Albemarle Sound should include about 40 miles in Croatan Sound, 2 miles over Bluff Shoal in Pamlico Sound, 10 miles in Core Sound, the inner and outer channels at Ocracoke Inlet, and the bar channel at Beaufort Inlet. The survey should also include the 18-mile waterway via Clubfoot and Harlowe Canal, between Neuse River and Beaufort Harbor, which is probably the best route between Pamlico Sound and Beaufort Inlet. Several previous reports have been made on similar proposed waterways, and there is a general agreement that the Clubfoot and Harlowe route is preferable to Core Sound. Capt. C. B. Phillips, Corps of Engineers, in his report dated January 15, 1880 (see p. 859, Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers for 1880), states:

"If Beaufort Inlet is desired as a passage to the ocean for vessels from the North, the Clubfoot and Harlowe Canal route would be more desirable and much less expensive to establish and maintain than the route via Core Sound"—and this statement apparently voices the opinions of all who have investigated the subject.

The advantages incident to the successful introduction of large (14 feet draft) seagoing barges for the business of the South Atlantic ports have been recognized by men interested in water transportation, and I am informed that several independent attempts to introduce them have been made, but each effort has been abandoned because of delays and perils incident to rounding Cape Hatteras.

An advantage of possibly great importance incident to a 16-foot waterway would be the establishment of an interior protected line for small naval vessels, torpedo boats, destroyers, etc. The fresh-water basins of Albemarle Sound and its ports would also be made available for such vessels.

The report of Captain Lucas contains the following indorsement by Colonel Hains, division engineer:

This is an important inland waterway, both from a commercial and a military standpoint. The entire line, however, should be under the control of the United States from end to end.

The report of survey by Major Quinn of that part of the route assigned to him contains valuable data and comments, from which I quote as follows:

"It is probable that the possibilities of constructing a navigable waterway so as to provide secure passage for small vessels from the waters of Virginia to those of North Carolina and farther south engaged the attention of the commercial and political leaders of colonial times, and I have no doubt but that Washington entertained expectations of some such achievement in later years when he undertook the construction of the canal through the Dismal Swamp, for in his time the terrors of the passage around Cape Hatteras were far more real than they are to-day, since the character of the vessels passing this route are vastly different. Yet ships at present, with all the advantages which steam propulsion affords, are not exempt from shipwreck upon the numerous shoals which envelop, like a web, this dangerous, storm-infested cape.

Vessels sailing between ports which will permit of a course far removed from Cape Hatteras may experience no inconvenience from the difficulties attending navigation in its vicinity, but it is safe to say that there is not a navigator who has occasion to round this cape but experiences a decided feeling of relief when he is well beyond the dangers which beset it, and probably there is not one of these who has not wondered why the advantages which the landlocked waterways of such apparent amplitude and continuity between the Chesapeake Bay and Beaufort Inlet have not been taken advantage of to the certain relief of all navigation between the first-named bay and Onslow Bay, at least.

Superficially the task seems easy. It is only when the engineer applies the formulas of his profession to the problem that difficulties arise. But, however formidable these difficulties may have appeared in the past, much that appeared impossible then, thanks to the wonderful advance in the mechanic arts, becomes possible to-day, and the consummation of this widely desired inland navigation between the North and the South approaches a condition of possible early achievement.

In determining the character of the work to be done, the nature of the commerce to be principally benefited has to be considered. The foreign commerce, since it requires the largest class of vessels, should be able to brave the dangers of Hatteras successfully, although, as a matter of fact, such vessels are from time to time wrecked in this vicinity. This interest is at present negligible, and will be of less importance as time passes.

The coastwise traffic, on the contrary, is of the first importance, and it is this commerce which is essentially national in character. Of the two classes of vessels engaged on this coastwise traffic, the large vessels which ply between widely separated ports could give the cape a wide berth, although during stormy periods a canal would be serviceable; generally the deep-sea water would be preferable, and the inland water route therefore unimportant. To the smaller class of vessels—barges and similar craft—a safe inland water route, such as is called for in the act directing the examination under discussion, is invaluable.

The present navigable waterway has a limit of 8 feet depth to the Ocracoke Inlet and 6 feet to Beaufort. This depth is inadequate for the full realization of the navigation possibilities or requirements of the routes. The benefits which have attended the development of an 8-foot navigation warrant the belief that the greater benefits which will result from a 16-foot channel are sufficient to warrant the undertaking as certain to be a profitable financial investment.

As has been amply demonstrated upon the Northern lakes, a depth of water which will permit the economic application of steam for the propulsion of freighters has resulted in the most extraordinary development of the country tributary to this navigation. Why should not a similar result attend the opening of an inland navigation of equal depth which is capable of extension from New York to Florida, and which would have direct connection with nearly all the navigable rivers which flow from the Allegheny Mountains to the Atlantic Ocean?

The safety from storms and disaster which such an inland route would afford would add greatly to the economy of transportation, and the economy of the transportation would invite commercial enterprises which at present are dormant, to the manifest disadvantage of the nation.

Colonel Hains, division engineer, made an indorsement on the foregoing report from which I quote as follows:

The opening of an inland waterway along the coast, avoiding Hatteras, is desirable both for commercial and military reasons. The entire waterway, however, should be under the control of the General Government. If the prescribed route is adhered to, that control would necessitate the purchase by the United States of the Dismal Swamp Canal, and then increasing the present depth of the latter from 10 feet to 16 feet and rebuilding the locks to correspond.

The Dismal Swamp Canal is a link in the chain, and if it is to remain the property of a private corporation, that corporation would have the power to dictate the depth that could be made available. There is another canal connecting the waters of the Chesapeake Bay with Albemarle Sound—the Albemarle and Chesapeake Canal. To improve the approaches to one and leave those of the other in their natural state would practically destroy the unaided one, for commerce will always follow the better route. In my opinion the Government, before entering on a costly scheme for improving this inland waterway, should control the entire route.

The final report of survey by Captain Lucas of that part of the route allotted to him is also very instructive. Omitting the details of the work and the cost of construction, I shall quote therefrom quite liberally:

Either the Ocracoke or Beaufort route will avoid Cape Hatteras, and the Ocracoke route has the decided advantage of costing less than half the cost of the Beaufort route; but it has the greater disadvantage of an outlet north of Cape Lookout, which, while not as dangerous as Hatteras, is still a serious menace to navigation, as shown by the estimated loss at that place of \$2,000,000 in vessels and cargoes during the nine years up to 1897 (see report on Cape Lookout Harbor of Refuge, printed in House Doc. No. 25, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session). The Ocracoke route has the further disadvantage of a southern terminus at an isolated fishing village which can never have railroad connections.

The Beaufort route has apparently the single disadvantage of greater cost, while its advantages over the Ocracoke route include (1) the very important one of avoiding Cape Lookout; (2) its proximity to Lookout Bight, where the establishment of a harbor of refuge has been contemplated for several years (see House Doc. No. 80, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session), and (3) its railroad terminus at Morehead City, just within the inlet. A harbor of refuge so near (7 miles) Beaufort Inlet would be a safeguard for vessels approaching the inlet to take the inland route when the weather is bad and the sea so heavy as to make passage of the inlet dangerous. The improvement of Beaufort Inlet will tend to develop Morehead City as a shipping point, and its railroad connection will permit the establishment there of machine shops and other necessities for refitting and repair.

Commercial statistics.—This inland waterway, if established, will affect the commerce of all South Atlantic ports, which consists of both foreign and coastwise shipments. The former need not be considered, as they are carried mainly in large steamers or sailing vessels which draw more than the proposed depth of the waterway and are equipped to weather heavy storms. Such vessels would hardly take advantage of the inside route.

The coastwise commerce is carried by steamers and sailing vessels, but not in seagoing barges, which can not be successfully used under existing conditions because of the dangers and delays incident to passing Cape Hatteras.

Steamers, as a rule, would not seek the inland route, as the gain in time by going outside more than compensates for the greater risk.

Sailing vessels are uncertain as to time, and would probably gain on a northwardly trip by being towed through Core Sound, sailing through Pamlico, Croatan, and Albemarle sounds, and being towed thence through the canal to Chesapeake Bay.

Seagoing barges can not under existing conditions be used for the commerce of the South Atlantic coast, as every effort to that end has conclusively demonstrated the prohibitory effect of the dangers and delays incident to passing Cape Hatteras. The South Atlantic ports are, therefore, at present debarred from using what is generally conceded to be the cheapest known form of transportation, which fact, in my opinion, constitutes the strongest argument in favor of establishing an inland waterway from Chesapeake Bay to Beaufort Inlet.

The value of the interests affected is very large, and the following estimates are submitted as a safe approximation to the probable amounts. They are believed to be fairly conservative and probably less than the amounts more accurate estimates would show. For instance, Savannah's coastwise traffic, mostly to and from North Atlantic ports, was in 1892 valued at about \$94,000,000 (annual report mayor of Savannah, 1892), and less than half that amount is given as Savannah's share of the commerce liable to be affected by the establishment of the inland waterway.

Estimated value of coastwise commerce liable to be affected by the establishment of inland water route to avoid Cape Hatteras.

Wilmington, N. C.	\$15,000,000
Georgetown, S. C.	3,075,000
Charleston, S. C.	35,000,000
Savannah, Ga.	43,885,000
Brunswick, Ga.	9,000,000
Fernandina, Fla.	1,214,000
Jacksonville, Fla.	9,000,000
Total	116,174,000

The above estimates cover cotton, lumber, naval stores, phosphates, coal, and general merchandise of a bulky character that could stand shipment by barge, and will probably aggregate from 5,000,000 to 10,000,000 tons annually. It is therefore probable that the proposed inland waterway, at an outside cost estimated at nearly \$4,000,000 for the part under consideration, will benefit a commerce amounting to at least \$115,000,000 annually, which would seem to indicate that it is a worthy improvement. The general manager of the bureau of freight and transportation of Charleston, S. C., thinks its effect would be much greater, as he states:

"It will not only give lower rates on lumber, naval stores, cotton, coal, etc., but will also be the means of reducing rates from the Western cities on all kinds of freight, of which the principal commodities are grain and its products, packing-house products, iron, bar iron, and innumerable other kinds of goods supplied by the West to the Southeast. This is true because the rates from the West to South Atlantic ports base on the rates from the Western cities to Norfolk plus the rail rate from Norfolk to Charleston."

It is possible effect on rates from Western cities to the South Atlantic coast is a very intricate question, and one difficult to determine justly; but the general argument is that as such rates are based on the rate to Norfolk plus the rate from Norfolk south, a reduction of rates between Norfolk and the

South will reduce the total rates between Western cities and the South Atlantic coast.

Conclusions.—That such an inland waterway as above described will be a very valuable acquisition to the country, and particularly to the South, will hardly be denied, and the only serious objection is its great cost. It remains, therefore, to determine whether or not the arguments in its favor are sufficient to warrant so great an expenditure.

These favorable arguments may be summarized as follows:

First, it will promote the establishment of large transportation between South Atlantic and Northern ports, with a probable consequent reduction of freight charges. On the estimated tonnage affected—say 5,000,000 tons annually—an average reduction of only 10 cents per ton would amount to \$500,000, which, at 5 per cent, is the interest on \$10,000,000, nearly double the total cost, including that part north of Albemarle Sound. In confirmation of the belief that reduced freight rates will follow the introduction of large transportation is the fact that since its introduction in the coal trade from Chesapeake Bay north the freight rates have been reduced more than half, and where a few years ago they amounted to from \$3 to \$5 per ton they are now from 75 cents to \$1.50 per ton.

Second, there will be a probable material reduction in insurance rates on coastwise freights, due to the elimination of the most dangerous part of the route. Marine insurance from this port to New York is by steamer one-fourth of 1 per cent and by sailing vessel an average of about three-fourths of 1 per cent. The lower rate on a total commerce of \$115,000,000 annually amounts to about \$287,500, which does not include the insurance on the vessels themselves.

Third, the inland waterway would afford an interior line of communication in time of war for transportation of supplies and for naval operations by light-draft vessels, such as torpedo boats and destroyers. Its value for such purpose can hardly be estimated, being similar to that of seacoast fortifications, which are rarely actually needed, but when the need arises it is most acute.

Fourth, there would be a probable large development of the country along the route of the proposed waterway, such as has followed other similar improvements. This of course can hardly be estimated.

Fifth, it would result in the establishment of a most important link in the chain of inland waterways that will eventually extend from the New England coast to Florida.

Upon a review of the above report by Colonel Hains, division engineer, he makes the following indorsement:

UNITED STATES ENGINEER OFFICE,
Baltimore, Md., December 1, 1900.

Respectfully submitted to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and reference requested to my indorsement, dated November 21, 1900, on the report of Maj. James B. Quinn, Corps of Engineers, on the northern part of this route, dated November 17, 1900.

The opinion expressed in that indorsement—that the United States should not undertake this work without controlling the whole route from end to end—is reiterated with additional emphasis. The corporation controlling the Dismal Swamp Canal can at any time dictate the depth to be made available for navigation, and also the draft and beam of vessels using this whole waterway. In my judgment, something more is necessary than a mere statement from the president of the company that means will be provided for giving increased dimensions to the canal before the United States commits itself to the expenditure of several millions of dollars for this improvement. While there is a link in the chain of waterways between the Northern and Southern States controlled by private interests there is a menace to the utility of the whole route, and this danger may at any time be greater from inability than from indisposition. It would be in the power of the corporation to blockade the whole route by delaying repairs to a break in its canal or its locks. The question of water supply to the summit level, which has not been considered in this report, might make the depth needed impracticable of realization.

It is within the range of possibility that if this waterway be constructed by the United States it may sometime in the future become desirable for military reasons, if not for commercial ones, to increase the dimensions of the navigable channel. In that event the corporation controlling the Dismal Swamp Canal could not be expected to anticipate a revenue from the military operations alone sufficient to justify the expenditure of a sum to make this link correspond in dimensions with the other parts of the waterway desired by the United States. Nor is the General Government confined to this specific route for an inland waterway connecting the Chesapeake Bay with Beaufort Inlet. A route via the Albemarle and Chesapeake Canal, and thence through Currituck Sound and a continuance by the route prescribed by the law, is available and should be considered if the United States is to do the work.

Both Cape Hatteras and Cape Lookout are dangerous to navigation, differing only in degree. To provide a waterway that will avoid Hatteras and cause the vessels using it to round Lookout would be only a partial and insufficient relief. A waterway with its southern outlet at Ocracoke Inlet is not as desirable as one with its southern limit at Beaufort, because of the menace to navigators at Lookout. In my opinion, therefore, that part of the route prescribed by the law and reading "including also cost of procuring a navigable depth of 18 feet through Ocracoke Inlet" is not worthy of being undertaken by the General Government in connection with the waterway now under consideration.

To sum up the estimate for the whole route of 174 miles in accordance with this indorsement and my previous one on Major Quinn's report, the following is found, except that the estimate of the latter should be increased correspondingly to my recommendation that "the width should not in any part, and particularly in the narrow and tortuous part, be less than 150 feet."

From South Mills to Albemarle Sound	\$1,133,893.62
Through Albemarle Sound to Beaufort Inlet Bar, excluding the route through Ocracoke Inlet	3,597,000.00

Total 5,532,893.62

The above includes a dredging plant for maintenance, and in my opinion the plant provided for will be sufficient for the whole route.

The estimate of the district engineer for maintenance should be \$100,000 annually at least.

This survey is for a project of great national importance, and should be undertaken only after the most careful consideration and study to see that the best route is adopted. I do not think the surveys thus far made determine this fact with certainty. This survey is for a particular route described in the law, leaving the engineer no discretion in the selection of a better one should it exist. There are other routes that should be examined and the best connection made between Albemarle Sound and Chesapeake Bay, whether it be via the Dismal Swamp Canal or the Albemarle and Chesapeake Canal. Moreover, the entire route should be owned by the United States.

I am clearly of the opinion that an inland waterway should be opened by the United States from Norfolk south, that it should be under the absolute

control of the United States from one end to the other, and that the Government would be justified in expending a considerable sum on such a work, but I think it very doubtful whether or not the route or depth prescribed in the law under which this survey is made is the best to be adopted.

In view of the above, and while I consider the work as worthy of being undertaken by the General Government, I am of the opinion that further surveys should be made to determine the best route and the most desirable width and depth.

The conclusions deduced from the foregoing reports of examinations and surveys may be summarized as follows:

(1) The project of an inland waterway from Norfolk Harbor to Beaufort Inlet is highly commended as one of national importance both for commercial reasons and from a military standpoint.

(2) That, in the language of Colonel Hains, "the entire line should be under the control of the United States from end to end," which would involve the purchase by the Government of either the Dismal Swamp Canal or the Albemarle and Chesapeake Canal, or both, and the Club Foot and Harlowe Canal, and the improvement and maintenance of each of these canals as a free waterway.

(3) That it would not be desirable to make Ocracoke Inlet the southern outlet to the ocean, but that Beaufort Inlet would be preferable for the reason that the dangers of Cape Lookout would also be avoided and because railroad connection would thereby be secured and the commercial possibilities of the waterway enhanced.

(4) That it is necessary to have further and exhaustive surveys of all existing and available routes between Norfolk Harbor and Beaufort Inlet with a view to the selection of the best route, and also to have the intervening canals surveyed and appraised with a view to their purchase by the Government.

For these reasons it was proposed to create a board of engineers to make all necessary surveys, including the probable cost of any intervening waterways, and make full report with recommendations to Congress, and this is embodied in the extract from the river and harbor bill quoted in the beginning of my remarks. The revival of this project has received the cordial indorsement of the press, both local and otherwise. The Wilmington (N. C.) Messenger, the Raleigh (N. C.) Post, the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer, the papers in Newbern, Washington, and Elizabeth City, and other towns in North Carolina have all contained favorable and repeated comments. The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot and the Norfolk Landmark and the press generally of that State have evinced a deep interest in it, recognizing its great advantages to that commercial port. The same is true of the influential newspapers of the South and also in the North.

This project should not be considered as an "iridescent dream," but should be diligently pursued with the object of ultimate success.

Safe and cheap transportation can never be accomplished between the North and the South by coastwise navigation as long as Cape Hatteras stands as a grim menace in the way. I have just read in the papers an oft-told tale of the attempt to navigate that dangerous part of our coast, and while in the instance given happily no lives were lost, yet experience was afforded which even the hardest navigator would not desire to repeat. I will read this press report:

NEW YORK, March 2, 1901.

The three-masted schooner *Edward H. Blake*, of Bangor, Me., arrived here to-day from Fernandina after a very rough passage of forty-seven days. The wife and daughter of Captain Smith, who were passengers on the vessel, are quite sick from the suffering and exposure they were compelled to undergo. Captain Smith said that from the time of leaving Fernandina the vessel was continuously pounded by heavy gales from the northwest and west. Five times she tried to pass Hatteras, only to be blown back each time. The worst day experienced was February 14, when the wind blew at the rate of 75 miles an hour, accompanied by hail, snow, and sleet. All that day the vessel ran before the wind under bare poles. Sails were blown away and split, and the sea dashing on the deck washed off part of the deckload and carried away the hatch covers over the forward and after houses and filled the houses with water. The cabin table was smashed by the seas which filled the cabin, and for days those aboard ate their meals sitting on the floor.

At another and more favorable time I shall ask the indulgence of the House for the purpose of elaborating more fully the history of this proposed waterway from Norfolk Harbor to Beaufort Inlet. It is by far the most important of all the interior waterways proposed, because it avoids the most dangerous coast navigation, because of the larger commercial possibilities to our country, and because it would affect a larger area of traffic.

OTHER LINKS IN THE CHAIN OF INLAND WATERWAYS.

From Norfolk Harbor proceeding northward, Chesapeake Bay is the finest of our inland bays and offers adequate depth of water. From this bay is reached the cities of Richmond, Baltimore, Washington, and numerous other important ports.

CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL.

Chesapeake Bay is connected with Delaware Bay by the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, and thus an inland route is afforded to the city of Philadelphia. This canal was constructed in 1824-1829 and is 13 miles long and extends from Chesapeake City to Delaware City. The capacity of this canal is not sufficient to accommodate the inland commerce which would seek it. It has had

varying stages of development and improvement, and at this time efforts are being renewed with a view to its conversion into a ship canal adequate to the needs of the present commerce.

DELAWARE AND RARITAN CANAL.

The necessity of a waterway to connect by inland passage the city of Philadelphia with the city of New York received early recognition and resulted in the construction of a canal connecting Delaware River at Bordentown with the city of New Brunswick on the Raritan River. This canal across the State of New Jersey was constructed in 1831-1834 and is about 43 miles long. This canal, likewise, does not meet the conditions of the present. Various efforts have been made from time to time to enlarge and improve it, none of which have justified the expectations of the promoters. The city of Philadelphia, in 1894, created a canal commission, composed of eminent and progressive men, for the purpose of locating a canal across New Jersey, with the view to the construction of an adequate waterway, which commission submitted an elaborate report on June 1, 1895, which is worthy of attention from all who are interested in this important project. I am not informed that any action was taken upon this report. Either an enlargement of the present canal or the construction of another canal across New Jersey along the route proposed by this commission is necessary to connect the two great cities of Philadelphia and New York and to form a part of this interior waterway.

From New York there is fine navigation through Long Island Sound and no serious difficulty is presented until Cape Cod is reached. This cape has produced its full share of disasters to coastwise shipping, and if the city of Boston and the New England coast is to have safe connection with New York and the remainder of this waterway, then another canal must be constructed.

CAPE COD CANAL.

The project of constructing a canal connecting Buzzards Bay on the south across the isthmus of Cape Cod and connecting with Barnstable Bay on the north has a long and interesting history. On May 10, 1870, Gen. J. G. Foster, of the Corps of Engineers, made a report to the Chief of Engineers in which he recites in detail the various attempts which have been made for the construction of this canal.

It appears that the Plymouth Colony as early as 1623 "used to communicate across the cape by boats which passed up the Scusset River to its head: thence by portage across the narrow neck of land between the head waters of the Scusset and Monumet rivers; and thence down the river in boats to its mouth, near which the town of Monumet stood, up to which, at that time, boats of 8 or 10 tons could come."

"In 1736 the isthmus was described in the annals of the cape as 'the place through which there has been a canal talked of this forty years, which would be a vast advantage to all the country by saving the long and dangerous passage around the cape and through the shoals adjoining.'"

The impatience of the colonists in that ancient time has never yet borne fruit, although the subject of this canal has often afforded interesting ground for discussion, and when the people of Boston tire of other subjects their minds revert with unvarying certainty to the subject of the Cape Cod Canal. Those who are curious upon this subject may also read the public documents of Massachusetts for 1863 containing the "report of the joint committee of 1860 upon the proposed canal to unite Barnstable and Buzzards Bay." I have read other interesting literature upon this canal, and at some time I may exercise the privilege of summarizing the efforts which have been made for its construction. The commercial interests of the great city of Boston should no longer neglect the construction of this canal. It would give their domestic commerce access to all the ports south of their city and would be equally convenient to the coastwise traffic of the other New England ports.

Thus it is that an interior waterway could be opened from Boston and New England extending continuously southward to Beaufort Inlet. Comparatively all the dangers of our coast would be avoided. The thousands of tons of valuable cargoes and the numerous vessels which are annually destroyed on our coast, to say nothing of the loss of human life, would be saved to commerce and to humanity.

HOW SHALL THE OBJECT BE ATTAINED?

In my humble judgment it is the duty of the National Government to construct and own and maintain these arteries of commerce. The great commercial interests in existence and in prospect justify the expenditure. Our present defenseless position in time of war and the value of this interior waterway in repelling invasion make it imperative upon the Government to commit itself to this great project.

No one State can claim a monopoly of interest. Every State along our seaboard from Maine to Florida have a present interest in its construction. Neither could the States of the great West claim exemption of interest. By reason of their Great Lakes and

the chain of canals which connect them with the Hudson River and thence with the seaboard, an outlet is given for their agricultural and manufactured products to the entire seaboard.

This subject only requires agitation. As soon as the country is informed of the manifold advantages which will result from this waterway Congress will act and will not longer withhold this need to our commerce and our defense.

Statue to Count Pulaski.

SPEECH

OF

HON. ABRAHAM L. BRICK,
OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 28, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 13295) for the erection of an equestrian statue to the memory of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski at Washington, D. C.

Mr. BRICK said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not make a speech, but I will state that I have about 10,000 Polish-American citizens in South Bend, perhaps pretty nearly one-third of the population of my native town. In that package is contained petitions of, I suppose, at least 22 societies of Polish-Americans from my home, for this statue. They think of Pulaski and particularize him in reference to some of the other Polish patriots who have helped to establish our liberty because of his chivalrous and peculiarly American qualities. They take it for granted that he was an American citizen. Colonel Smolinski has shown that by indisputable documents. While Kosciuszko, Baron Steuben, Lafayette, and others came here, they lived to enjoy the fruits of their labor; but Pulaski, at the age of 32, after two years' service in this country and more than that service in the cause of liberty in his own country, gave not only his genius, patriotism, and chivalry, the same as did Washington, Lafayette, and others, but he gave even more—he gave all he had, his life.

After listening to the eloquent and able memorial prepared by my friend and associate in this cause, Col. Joseph Smolinski, it will hardly be necessary for me further to absorb the time of your committee. At the best I could add but little to the force and effect of his words. But I wish to thank you, Mr. McCLEARY, for the numberless courtesies and many acts of assistance given to this cause by you, and also your committee for the courtesy extended Colonel Smolinski and myself in this matter, and at the same time emphasize as best I can what he has said.

The debt we owe to our distinguished dead is a sacred memory that only ingratiated time can pay. Over a hundred years ago a great man died. He died as he lived, a noble and undaunted warrior, fighting the battles of liberty and of the Republic.

To-day his ashes mingle with the sea or soil of Georgia, and his soul goes marching on with Washington and Lafayette in a land where strife no longer sounds, and death is but the opening door.

I speak of Count Casimir Pulaski.

Though born in Poland, no purer patriotism glowed in the breast of any Revolutionary father than was kindled in the heart of Count Pulaski for American freedom.

No nobler sentiment ever lived in deeds of valor than burned in him who gave up love, and youth, and fortune, and all that man may hope or live for, to bear the toil and dangers of a distant land in an unequal contest, an almost hopeless cause. But it was the cause his father and all his kinsmen had died for; it was the thing his native country had on bended knees prayed for. It was the arrogant power and brutal force on the one side, with justice and rights of human kind upon the other, that incited him to give up a life of splendid hope and growing fame for freedom and for us. He devoted all this with no thought of spoil or hope of conquest. He was called to this by no strident voice of conflict or revelry of war. But he came to us with his youth, his genius, his patriotism, his life, in that godly consecrated love of liberty and humanity that is conceived and finds its home in a martyr's mind.

The martyrdom he suffered for the Republic could spring only from a great moral principle born with him, bequeathed to him by his ancestors, and inspired by the environment of his life.

In the evolution of moral crises great men grow. They bud and blossom in the earth and air that evolves them. The heart at first reechoes and then becomes the home. So it was with Pulaski. He fought and died for America in the saddened love he bore for fair Poland, ravaged, pillaged, and denationalized, the darkest tragedy, the blackest chapter, in the annals of human misery, unparalleled in crimsoned history. They killed his father, murdered his country, coerced his people, or drove them into

exile. Such was the heart that Pulaski brought to George Washington, with a letter from Benjamin Franklin, introducing him as "one of the greatest officers in Europe." He won that magnificent compliment from the great American by his talents and his patriotism, his heroic and dashing courage, his towering genius, his unshaken loyalty, his incorruptible honor, his indomitable love of country, and his deeds of heroism through eight long and despairing years of bloody war in Poland—achievements that barely escaped the miraculous and almost challenged belief.

While a gleam of hope remained he fought for Poland with relentless energy and brilliant resource; but the combined power of three mighty empires crushed a valiant people, and Poland fell. They drove him from his country heartbroken, but not vanquished. He was the last to retire from the glorious contest.

Always superior to events, formidable in victory, he was also great in defeat. To have rushed into slavery or death would have been a useless sacrifice. He chose rather to live, to fight, to battle for liberty on the western shores of the Atlantic tide, to seek in the New World a land where kings were yet unborn, where freedom was a star and thrones were dust. He fled from the hallowed land of his birth, consecrated with the blood of his father and brothers and his heart's sad devotion, to prepare a place for his countrymen—a place filled with the freedom they had dreamed of and died for.

To-day over 2,000,000 sons and daughters of Poland cherish the fame of Pulaski in this country. Destiny delights to mingle in the veins of American greatness the invigorating blood of many peoples. Let us erect a statue to Pulaski that shall reincarnate in his embazoned memory the love and patriotism of all his people; yes, more, 80,000,000 of the happiest, proudest citizens of the world.

He was a soldier in the highest and best sense of the word, with a brain quick to receive and agile to execute. He brooked no opposition that he did not meet; he was unwearied in perseverance and possessed a courage that was always ready, but never rash. He sacrificed himself, all the years of his young life, his fortune, his ancestral dignity, his lofty spirit, his splendid genius, and all his earthly hopes for liberty, justice, and humanity. For these he gave all he had—his martyred life.

Others lived to enjoy the plaudits of men and a happy freedom, made possible through their valor and his, but he died. They lived to see the sunshine, but he fell in the smoke of battle, in the war-lit night, in the expiring gloom of the oldest Republic—his native land—and in the agonizing birthpain of the youngest child—his adopted country.

Let us see that his memory survives his martyrdom. Let the gratitude of the nation commemorate his heroism in the multiplied patriotism of his children by rendering him due honor.

The Continental Congress pledged that pious duty in 1779, while yet his deeds were young, but in the cumulating press of great responsibilities it has never been redeemed.

I hope we will wait no longer to wipe away the stain of a nation's forgetfulness and ingratitude to a brave man but speedily erect a statue to his enduring fame, and I ask that in connection with my remarks Colonel Smolinski's memorial be printed. No more elegant or fitting words will ever be said about a great man and a great people.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 22, 1901.

Memorial of Gen. Count Casimir Pulaski, by Col. Joseph Smolinski, of Washington, D. C., representative of the Polish-American organizations in the United States in the Pulaski monument movement, etc.

No page of American history is so full of interest as the one which relates to the Revolutionary period. It gave birth to the highest ideals of patriotism, to the loftiest spirit of devotion to country, immortalized in a thousand glorious actions which constitute a common patrimony of the nation's proud inheritance.

When from the belfry of old Independence Hall Liberty Bell tolled the glad news which announced to the struggling colonists and proclaimed to the world the birth of a new republic with its civilization, democratic institutions, true liberty, and individuality of citizenship, there appeared on the political horizon, among the galaxy of heroes who left their impress upon time, three names which take high rank on the pages of contemporaneous history.

They stand out in bold relief in the Temple of Fame, and the glory which enshrines their memories will grow brighter and brighter as the years roll on. We refer with patriotic pride to the illustrious George Washington, the epitome of whose life is written in the significant and familiar legend: "Father of his country; first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." Next is the last general of the Polish Republic, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, whose life, indeed, was "poetry put into action," of whom the poet wrote at the sad hour of his death:

"Hope for a season bade the world farewell,
And Freedom shrieked as Kosciuszko fell."

And last, but not least, is the Phil Sheridan of the American cavalry, the brave Casimir Pulaski, who lost his life at the siege of Savannah. The last two warriors were the tried and trusted friends of the immortal Washington, their illustrious commander in chief. They were men of military genius, noble sons of the fair land of Poland, conspicuous exemplars of unswerving fidelity to principle, bright symbols of patriotism and patriotic endeavor, champions of universal freedom.

What greater gift can a people bequeath to a nation than monuments of art which not only symbolize heroic deeds and virtuous actions of great and good men and women, but as object lessons immortalize the achievements of

true greatness, so that the generations as they come and go may draw inspiration from the glories of art which so eloquently tell the story of the lives of those whose heroism and virtues stimulate action and excite admiration?

If the assertion is true, who is more deserving of this degree of immortalization than Brig. Gen. Count Casimir Pulaski? The sentiment of appreciation of his worth and meritorious services was emphasized by the representatives of the Continental Congress, who were first to conceive the idea of erecting a monument to his memory. It originated during the stirring period of the war of the Revolution, of which he was one of the heroes and a martyr.

On the 29th of November, 1779, a letter, dated October 31 of that year, from Major-General Lincoln, was read in the Continental Congress. It inclosed a communication of the 5th, same month, from Lieutenant-Colonel Bedaulx, of Pulaski's Legion, announcing the death of the last-named officer, whereupon Congress

"Resolved, That a monument be erected to the memory of Brigadier Count Pulaski, and that a committee of three be appointed to bring in a resolution for that purpose."

"The members chosen: Mr. Gerry, Mr. Livingston, and Mr. Harnett."

After a most careful research among the archives of the Continental Congress, I found no record whatever showing that the resolution was carried out, and consequently the stone of the then proposed monument remains in the quarry.

After the lapse of more than a century, with the record of a vote still standing on the pages of the Journals of the Continental Congress as a public recognition of the eminent services of our hero, as well as an indication of a Republic's forgetfulness, I will not say ingratitude, the Polish-American citizens of our land, who number nearly 3,000,000 of souls, desire and pray that this Congress, the first of the twentieth century, redeem the pledge promised by the Continental Congress, and thus give evidence of the nation's gratitude in appreciation of the meritorious services and noble character of Pulaski, who shed his blood in order that the infant Republic might live.

From out that galaxy of heroes who gave our nation an historic beginning at a momentous period of the world's history not excelled even by the Olympian memories of Pericles, who pictured in thundering eloquence Athenian patriotism, there is one among the many far-shining men, whose renown in valor and deeds is the record of a golden page of our national history, to which it has imparted dignity. This one man I single out as a foreigner by birth, a noble son of that most ancient nation—Poland; a stranger, if you please, but a dear brother by adoption, a veritable Bayard, "without fear and without reproach," a champion in the cause of the oppressed in the cause of freedom, a hero of liberty, nay, an American citizen, baptized in his own blood on the plains of Savannah while defending our beloved land against the enemy.

This proud warrior and hero of liberty gives us in his imperfect English the keynote to his lofty character. I quote from one of his unpublished letters to the Continental Congress, dated Charlestown, August 19, 1779, read before that body October 1, 1779, in which also appears his declaration to become an American citizen:

"I could not submit to stoop before the sovereigns of Europe, so I came to hazard all for the freedom of America, desirous of passing the rest of my life in a country truly free, and before settling as a citizen to fight for liberty."

Then in an outburst of indignation at the intrigues and injustice operating in those days as well as in our day, he continues: "But perceiving that endeavors are used to disgust me against such a motive, and to regard it as phantasm, I am inclined to believe that enthusiasm for liberty is not the predominant virtue in America at this time," and concludes thus: "The campaign is at hand. Perhaps I may still have an occasion of showing that I am a friend to the cause without being happy enough to please some individuals." (Papers Continental Congress, No. 164, page 108.)

It is in the revival of the recollections of what Pulaski did in the cause of freedom on two continents that we are stirred by a sense of deep gratitude and a loyal, patriotic appreciation, willing as lovers of liberty to give evidence of that inspiration born of his example, made holy by his death, in erecting to his memory a monument worthy of his name and fame; one that shall remain on our sacred soil in the nation's great capital, an object lesson, an educator, silent though it be, that shall cause his compatriots to love and cherish more and more as the generations go and come their obligations to this our beloved country, and by thus making them good citizens they will be better fortified and imbued with a proper spirit and a higher ideal of American citizenship against the demoralizing tendencies and pernicious influences of the present day.

Gentlemen, around this monument we pray you to erect, inspired by the fond memories that shall cluster around it and cling to it like the ivy, there shall grow up that magnificent, ideal citizenship, second to none in the sum of national greatness, that shall insure the safety of the Republic and its perpetuity.

What claim has Pulaski to this recognition?

If, indeed, time lends importance to high station, and emphasizes its consecration of heroes and heroic actions in the glories of art, surely the principles of right and justice which they upheld in former times will lose none of their force in the triumphant present.

Few names of the stirring period of the eighteenth century have come down to us with more dignity, or clothed in greater attractive romance, than the intrepid Lithuanian, Pulaski, who, like his illustrious compatriot and companion in arms, Kosciusko, touches the tender chords of our sympathy.

Born in 1747, and while yet a youth, he pledged his life and fortune to liberate his country, both from the invader and the disturbing elements within, under the famous compact of the confederation of Barr, organized by his patriotic father, Count Pulaski, in 1768, who, together with another son, was lost in the great fight for Polish independence.

In the struggles which preceded the first partition of Poland, in 1772, he commanded in many actions and military operations against the flower of the Russian army. His wonderful endowments, skill, and intrepidity excited the admiration of Europe and drew forth from the writers of the day such estimate of his worth as a soldier as is given in a letter to Washington, dated Paris, June 13, 1777, which reads:

"Count Pulaski, who was a general of the confederates in Poland and who is gone to join you, is esteemed one of the greatest officers in Europe." (Diplomatic correspondence of the Revolution, Wharton, vol. 2, p. 339.)

We all know the sad story of the downfall of ill-fated Poland, and we know, too, what herculean efforts Pulaski, Kosciusko, and other brave companions in arms made to prevent the enactment of the saddest picture of time, that horrid scene, the crucifixion of Poland, the foulest blot on the world's civilization.

Noble Spartan, hopeful to the last that his country will again rise triumphant from the grave of oppression, he saw, like a bright vision from afar, the beautiful temple of liberty building on the Western Hemisphere. There beneath the furis of our starry banner his compatriots would find a home in the land of the free.

His generous impulse to serve the struggling colonists, his martial enthusiasm and love of liberty is forcibly expressed in the following letter of

Franklin, the accredited representative of the Colonies to France, which resulted in Pulaski's admission to Washington's war council in the days which tried men's souls:

"Count Pulaski, of Poland, an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in the defense of the liberties of his country against the three great invading powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, will have the honor of delivering this into your hands. The court here have encouraged and promoted this voyage from an opinion that he may be highly useful in our service."

Briefly, in the summer of 1777 he arrived in Philadelphia, entered the service as a volunteer, served, successively, under Washington, Green, Wayne, Sullivan, Lafayette, Lincoln, etc. At Brandywine, where the first blows for American independence were struck, his skill, endurance, and bravery were so marked that Washington intrusted him with the command of his body-guard during the close of that memorable action. A few days after the battle "the Father of his Country," in recommending our hero to Congress for appointment and commission as a brigadier-general, says:

"This gentleman has been, like us, engaged in defending the liberty and independence of his country, and has sacrificed his fortune to his zeal for these objects. He derives from hence a title to our respect that ought to operate in his favor as far as the good of the service will permit."

The record shows that Congress confirmed this recommendation, and on September 15, 1777, he was commissioned a brigadier-general and chief of dragoons in the United States Army, though but 30 years of age, having previously been designated as commander of an independent corps, known as the Pulaski Legion, March 28, 1778.

Furthermore, it was left to Pulaski, the father of American cavalry, to demonstrate the value of this arm of the military service, aptly called "the eye of the Army," which up to his coming the Lees, Sumters, Marions, and William Washington failed to show. None of the officers named held higher rank than that of colonel. Pulaski was the first general of cavalry in the American military establishment.

To follow this fearless cavalryman in his rides through the storms of battle from the Atlantic to the Gulf would occupy too much time. American history, written by numerous versatile pens, contains graphic accounts of his brilliant services.

In conclusion, I invite attention to the last sad drama in his short but eventful life. It was while gallantly leading the combined American and French cavalry forces against the enemy he received his death wound at the siege of Savannah, Ga., October 9, 1779, and as he was borne from that memorable field moistened with his precious blood, turning to Light Horse Harry Lee, as that officer was familiarly called, he gave him, in feeble accents, this last command: "Follow my lancers, to whom I have given my order of attack;" and on October 11, 1779, his spirit took its flight heavenward—called off duty forever.

His memorable charge is thus described by one of his staff officers, Major Rogowski:

"For half an hour the guns roared and blood flowed abundantly. Seeing an opening between the enemy's works, Pulaski resolved, with his legion and a small detachment of Georgia cavalry, to charge through, enter the city, confuse the enemy, and cheer the inhabitants with good tidings. General Lincoln approved the daring plan. Implored the help of the Almighty, Pulaski shouted to his men 'Forward!' and we, 200 strong, rode at full speed after him, the earth resounding under the hoofs of our chargers."

"For the first two moments all went well. We sped like knights into the peril. Just, however, as we passed the gap between the two batteries a cross fire, like a pouring shower, confused our ranks. I looked around. Oh! sad moment, ever to be remembered, Pulaski lies prostrate on the ground. I leaped toward him, thinking possibly his wound was not dangerous, but a canister shot had pierced his thigh and the blood was also flowing from his breast, probably from a second wound. Falling on my knees I tried to raise him. He said, in a faint voice, 'Josuel Maria! Joseph!' Further I knew not, for at that moment a musket ball, grazing my scalp, blinded me with blood, and I fell to the ground in a state of insensibility."

"He was borne from the bloody field, and, after the conflict was over, was conveyed on board the United States brig *Wasp*, to go round to Charleston. The ship, delayed by head winds, remained several days in Savannah River, and, during this period, he was attended by the most skillful surgeons in the French fleet. It was found impossible to establish suppuration, and gangrene supervened. As the *Wasp* was leaving the river, Pulaski breathed his last. His corpse became so offensive that Colonel Bentalon, his officer in attendance, was compelled, though reluctantly, to consign to a watery grave all that was now left upon earth of his beloved and honored commander."

Gentlemen, it is to the memory of this great and good man—a fearless soldier, a hero of the war of the Revolution, entitled to the proud distinction of being numbered among the founders of our Republic, an exemplar of patriotism, a champion of liberty, of whom Washington said, "His valor and active zeal on all occasions have done him great honor"—that we Polish-American citizens—I should say American citizens—pray you to immortalize by erecting to his memory a monument of American art which shall stand out in bold relief as the noblest expression of a people's heartfelt gratitude. Thus, too, will this monument, like all others, serve the office of history by endearing in the hearts and minds of generations yet unborn the memories which cluster around the great Revolutionary struggle for liberty, and instill a better appreciation of the sacrifices made by the patriots of 1776, whose heroism we must admire if we can not imitate.

It is designed that this statue, as a work of art, shall emanate from this country. We are treating General Pulaski as an American citizen, which he was, while honoring a hero of liberty who fought on two continents for human freedom.

We believe that this great desire expressed by organized effort to erect a monument to the memory of Pulaski will have a very beneficial effect upon the Poles of this country; we believe it will attach them more dearly to our flag, and as they seem to have an almost idolatrous love for heroism and heroes, and as Pulaski was one of our great Revolutionary characters, we think this monument will have that great tendency.

It will do more than this by emphasizing our appreciation of the inestimable blessings we as a people enjoy as the result of sacrifices made and victories won by the patriots of 1776. To keep alive the memory of heroes through whose sacrifices deliverance came and freedom was made possible, we must not forget the debt of gratitude we owe to the foreigners who so generously aided the immortal Washington in establishing our great Republic.

Let us, then, erect a monument of granite and bronze that shall perpetuate the memory of the heroic dead, Pulaski, who—

"In the thickest fight triumphantly he fell,
While into victory's arms he led us on;
A death so glorious our grief should quell;
We mourn him, yet his battle crown is won."

Liberty was the goal, the price of which was his precious life, and our gratitude should be commensurate with the share of glory that attaches to his noble sacrifice.

JOSEPH SMOLINSKI.

Rural Free Delivery.

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE W. CROMER,

OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, February 5, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13729) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902—

Mr. CROMER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not claim to be either the father or step-father of rural free delivery, though some of my colleagues have done so with, I think, a less defensible title. But I have taken quite an active part in my individual capacity in the development of the service. Before I became a member of this House, or a candidate before a nominating convention, I personally rode over three or four of the first routes in Delaware County, Ind., now part of the district which I represent in Congress, and aided to the best of my ability the special agent assigned to that duty in establishing such service as would meet the wishes of the people.

RURAL FREE DELIVERY A GOOD THING FOR THE PEOPLE AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES.

I frankly own that the extension of mail facilities to the rural population of my district has helped me greatly with my constituents, and that the general results have been so beneficial that I am very desirous of aiding them to obtain further service along the same line. This sentiment, I think, will be shared by other members of this House, not even excluding the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads [Mr. Loun], although it is his humorous fancy to speak slightly of rural free delivery, and to say that its benefits are more apparent than real, and that it is something of which the more a man has the worse off he finds himself.

Nevertheless, I notice from the official records that my friend has not fewer than 20 rural free-delivery routes in full running order in his home county of Santa Clara, Cal., each application bearing, as I understand, his indorsement. If there is more than one spot in that county below the fringing mountain peaks which encompass it that is not visited at least once a day by a rural letter carrier I would like the topographical officers of the Post-Office Department to point it out to me.

According to their official maps rural free delivery honeycombs the whole county of Santa Clara from the mountains to the sea, with the exception of one little community in the neighborhood of San Jose, and in regard to that accidental omission I am informed that an application for extension of rural free delivery is on file and is being urgently pressed for action. I wish all the counties in my district were as well provided for. If the gentleman's theory is correct, he must be very badly off indeed.

For myself, I admit that the more I get of rural free delivery the more I want and the more my people want. It is a good thing, Mr. Chairman, a great humanizing, civilizing influence, which can not be stopped by a sneer. You might as well try to check Niagara as to prevent the spread of rural free delivery, in due time, over all these United States.

INDIANA FURNISHED THE REAL STEPFATHER.

If, as I have before said, I make no claim of paternal rights to rural free delivery for myself, I do not wish my disclaimer to extend to my State. Indiana has been a pioneer in this great movement, and one of the sons of Indiana, the recent First Assistant Postmaster-General, Perry Sanford Heath, was the chief agent in vitalizing it into active life.

In one of the public offices of the Post-Office Department the other day I came across some artistically engrossed resolutions, which were in part as follows:

The special agents in charge of the various divisions of rural free delivery, meeting in Washington to discuss questions affecting the service, desire to express their deep regret at the departure of the Hon. Perry S. Heath from the office of First Assistant Postmaster-General. They appreciate that it is in a very large degree due to his wisdom, foresight, and wide knowledge of the country that the present extension of rural free delivery has been made possible. If he can not claim to be the father of rural free delivery, he found it shivering on the steps of the Post-Office Department, took it in out of the cold, and has been to it a good and generous stepfather. His official voice and private pen have been steadily used to win it welcome, to curb carping criticism, and to pave the way to popularity. His name must always be indissolubly connected with the success of rural free delivery.

That tells the whole story in a few words. It comes from the men who were "behind the guns."

DELAYS ARE DANGEROUS.

Most members of this House, Mr. Chairman, who have rural constituents have probably become aware, long before this time, of the

firm grip which this feature of postal development has taken on all the plain people of this country who have tried it or have even heard of it. If there should be anyone who is not yet aware of this fact, I can assure him he has an experience in store which will make his life unhappy just as soon as his constituents find out what they are missing.

In my own Congressional district, comprising seven counties of the State of Indiana, I have 39 applications on hand, and the petitioners in each case insist that they have as much right to receive prompt consideration as those in the other 25 cases where one or more rural free-delivery routes have been started. They give me no rest by day or night, and I find it hard to answer them. In fact, it is difficult to point out why one community should, even for a time, be preferred over any other, and the aphorism "First come, first served," is not always an explanation that satisfies.

RURAL FREE DELIVERY THE SERVICE OF THE FUTURE.

The sooner Congress faces the fact that rural free delivery is to be the service of the future, superseding all other service in rural communities, and makes provision accordingly, the better it will be, in my judgment, for Congress and the country. It is about time we dropped the word "experimental" in our annual appropriations. It was a fitting word to use when the appropriation was limited to \$50,000 a year; it was not out of place when we raised it to \$150,000 in 1898, and to \$450,000 in 1899; but with an appropriation of \$1,750,000 for the present fiscal year and a pending provision of \$3,500,000 for rural free-delivery service for the fiscal year that is coming, "experimental" becomes a misnomer, especially when (as my colleagues on the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads well know) we would have been prepared to recommend a much larger amount than \$3,500,000 if the Department had seen its way clear to immediately and profitably use it.

I have in my hand, Mr. Chairman, a compilation entitled "Rural Free Delivery as a Permanent Branch of the Postal Service." It is an official reprint of those portions of the President's message at the opening of the present session of Congress and of the reports of the Postmaster-General and First Assistant Postmaster-General which bear upon rural free delivery. The President speaks of the rapid growth of rural free delivery in the past year as the most striking development of the postal service. He states that—

At the beginning of the fiscal year 1899-1900 the number of routes in operation was only 391, and most of these had been running less than twelve months. On the 15th of November, 1900, the number had increased to 2,614, reaching into forty-four States and Territories, and serving a population of 1,801,524. The number of applications now pending and awaiting action nearly equals all those granted up to this time, and by the close of the current fiscal year about 4,000 routes will have been established, providing for the daily delivery of mails at the scattered homes of about three and a half millions of rural population.

Speaking of the benefits derived, he says:

This service ameliorates the isolation of farm life, conduces to good roads, and quickens and extends the dissemination of general information. Experience thus far has tended to allay the apprehension that it would be so expensive as to forbid its general adoption or make it a serious burden. Its actual application has shown that it increases postal receipts and can be accompanied by reductions in other branches of the service, so that the augmented revenues and the accomplished savings together materially reduce the net cost.

THE COST MAY BE EVEN LESS THAN ESTIMATED.

The Postmaster-General takes up the question of cost, and by three different methods of computation, based upon existing service, namely: (1) The cost per square mile; (2) the cost per capita, and (3) the cost per county, where county service has been established, demonstrates that rural free delivery could be extended over all practicable parts of the country at a gross cost of \$20,555,000.

Against this he offsets, upon estimates which in my judgment are exceedingly moderate, savings from discontinuance of fourth-class post-offices \$2,759,400
Savings from discontinuance of star routes 2,500,000
To this he adds increase of postal receipts, resulting from increased postal facilities (another moderate estimate) 1,573,973
Leaving the net cost of universal rural free delivery 13,782,224

Much less than the amount that is annually wasted by the improvident provisions of law relating to the transportation of second-class mail matter.

MISSTATEMENTS CORRECTED.

My esteemed friend, the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads [Mr. Loun], has thought proper to question these figures, but he has done so on mistaken information, in my opinion. He states that when a post-office is abolished by reason of rural free delivery the receipts of that office go to some other office and that practically there is no profit in the transaction. I think it due to Congress and the Department that this statement should not go upon record unchallenged. The post-offices superseded by rural free delivery are offices of the fourth class, whose entire cancellations, so long as they exist, pass into the pockets of the postmasters and form their compensation.

When, by reason of rural free delivery, the receipts of these abolished offices are transferred to a post-office of higher class, this may perhaps result in raising the grade of that office, and consequently

in an increase of the salary of the postmaster, but only to the extent of 10 per cent on the increased receipts. In other words, for every \$100 the Department adds to a postmaster's salary because of rural free delivery enhancing the grade of his office it collects and turns into the Treasury \$1,000 in increased postal revenues. Surely there is a "profit" in this, to say nothing of the saving by discontinued star routes.

SAVINGS ON STAR ROUTES.

I have in my mind several instances in my own district where the star routes abolished by rural free delivery nearly pay the cost of the rural service, without taking any other economies into consideration. Take Modoc, Randolph County, Ind., for example. When rural free delivery started there, on the 6th of December last, it superseded a star route, for which \$313 a year was paid to the contractor simply to drop a lock pouch at a little post-office without performing any other service. The rural carrier now drops that pouch and distributes mail to over 200 families on his route at a cost of only \$500 a year. The second month after he started the service the postal receipts doubled.

At Montpelier, Blackford County, Ind., also in my district, one rural carrier has superseded two star routes which cost \$285 a year and which made no deliveries or collections on the road.

Another star route, discontinued from Lowell, Ind., because of rural delivery, cost the Department \$138 a year to supply a \$35 post-office.

The report of the First Assistant Postmaster-General (which the gentleman from California must certainly have overlooked) cites striking examples where rural free delivery, in addition to giving incomparably better service to the people, actually effects a saving to the Department. I quote one case from page 42 of that report:

Baldwin, Douglas County, Kans. Established November 1, 1900. One carrier, at \$500 per annum.

Post-offices discontinued:	Annual compensation.
Holling	\$53.97
Echo	43.26
Willow Springs	56.81
Globe	32.26
Pleasantgrove	66.73
Star route discontinued:	
No. 55158	384.34
Cost of post-office and star route discontinued	657.37
Gross cost of rural free delivery	500.00
Net saving of rural free delivery	157.37

The "profit" in this transaction does not admit of dispute. There are no accompanying extra charges. The salary of no postmaster has been increased; but on the other hand there has been a great increase in the volume of mail handled since rural free delivery was started, this to go to the credit side.

MIX UP OF TWO OPPOSING SERVICES.

My distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads [Mr. LOUD], replying to some remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], made another statement in regard to the cost of rural free delivery which is liable to lead to misapprehension. He said, as I understood him, that the present law prohibited a rural carrier from carrying a letter past a post-office, and that he must deposit it in one of the offices on his route, so that though he might perform the physical act of canceling the stamp, this act would not deprive the postmaster of receiving his percentage as a fourth-class postmaster.

The gentleman has mixed up the star route and the rural free delivery services. Star-route contractors are required to observe the regulation he quotes. A rural free-delivery carrier, on the contrary, can pass twenty fourth-class post-offices if there should happen to be so many on his route, and he is not required by the regulations of the Department to deposit his mail in any one of these unless by so doing he can facilitate its dispatch by an earlier train than by carrying it back to the office from which he starts.

The "mix up" of star route and rural free delivery service seems to be general. My friend from South Carolina [Mr. STOKES] in the course of this debate claimed to be another of the "stepfathers" of rural free delivery. These "stepfathers" are getting to be almost as numerous as the "Daughters of the Revolution." But the adopted offspring of the gentleman from South Carolina was not rural free delivery. The bill he introduced provided for a star-route delivery, and not a rural free delivery. The service he advocates is set out in an official notice which was distributed over his State, a copy of which I have before me. It reads:

STAR ROUTE BOX DELIVERY.

Notice is hereby given to the public that the contracts for carrying the mail on all of the star routes in the State of South Carolina taking effect July 1, 1900, provide that those who so desire may have the mail that is addressed to them delivered by the carriers into boxes along the lines of the several routes.

Any person living on or near any star route in the State named who desires his mail deposited in a box on the line of the route by the carrier on said route may provide and erect a suitable box on the roadside, located in such manner as to be reached as conveniently as practicable by the carrier, and such person shall file with the postmaster at the post-office to which his mail is addressed (which shall be one of the two post-offices on the route on either side of and next to the box)

a request in writing for the delivery of his mail to the carrier on the route for deposit in said mail box, at the risk of the addressee.

It shall be the duty of the postmaster at every such post-office, upon a written order from any person living on or near the star route, to deliver to the proper mail carrier for that route any mail matter, except registered mail, with instructions as to the proper mail box into which said mail matter shall be deposited; but no mail matter so delivered to a carrier for deposit shall be carried past another post-office on the route before being deposited in a mail box.

The carrier on the star route will be required to receive from any postmaster on the route any mail matter that may be intrusted to him, outside of the usual mail bag, and shall carry such mail matter to and deposit it in the proper boxes placed on the line of the route for this purpose; such service by the carrier to be without charge to the addressee.

The mail carriers must be able to read and write the English language and be of sufficient intelligence to properly handle and deposit the mail for boxes along the routes.

The law provides that every carrier of the mail shall receive any mail matter presented to him, if properly prepaid by stamps, and deliver the same for mailing at the next post-office at which he arrives, but that no fees shall be allowed him therefor.

The contract price covers all the service required of the carrier that is indicated herein.

W. S. SHALLENBERGER,
Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

Please bring this to the attention of persons residing on star routes.

STAR ROUTE DELIVERY AN INEFFICIENT SUBSTITUTE.

Substantially similar provisions were included in the official advertisement issued by the contract division of the Post-Office Department some time last November inviting proposals for star-route contracts. I believe I am justified in saying that the project of adapting star routes to rural free delivery has absolutely failed of public acceptance. The two services are not in the same class in point of efficiency.

A star-route contractor can not cancel a stamp or deliver a letter on his route. He can not pass a post-office without dumping the mail he has collected into that office, whether it belongs there or not. He can not register a letter or receipt for a money order. He can not sell postage stamps or receive an unstamped letter accompanied by the necessary coin to pay for the postage.

All these and many other services which the rural free delivery carrier is authorized to perform place that service on a plane so far above the suggested star-route box substitute that no comparison can be made between them. The people have everywhere replied, "We don't want the star-route subterfuge; we want rural free delivery."

HARMONY OF ACTION NECESSARY.

My firm conviction, Mr. Chairman, is that if harmonious action can be established between the conflicting executive bureaus of the Post-Office Department, which now have charge, respectively, of the establishment of rural free delivery and the continuance of fourth-class post-offices and star routes, rural free delivery can be made universal at a much less cost than that named in the estimate of the Postmaster-General, namely, thirteen millions a year.

I believe First Assistant Postmaster-General Johnson had the law, the facts, and the figures at his back when in his recent report he said:

Most of the arguments at one time advanced to prove that the expense of rural free delivery would swamp the postal revenues, and could never be counterbalanced by saving in other service dispensed with or by resulting increase of postal receipts, have been refuted by the logic of actual facts, of which salient illustrations will be found in other portions of this report. In nearly every instance where this demonstration is not made clear the result has arisen from confusion of jurisdiction, susceptible of remedy by administrative or legislative direction.

As between rural free delivery and other services, I am for rural free delivery first, last, and all the time.

Post-Office Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WM. ALDEN SMITH,
OF MICHIGAN.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 31, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13729) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902—

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have listened with interest and amazement to the speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] who has just taken his seat. He says in regard to rural free mail delivery that it should not be supported from the income of post-offices in large cities. From this statement I wholly dissent. Does not the gentleman from Illinois overlook the fact that cities would not prosper were it not for the prosperous condition of the farmer; that the agriculturist is more closely related to the welfare,

development, and prosperity of the country than any other class of our citizens? When he prospers, all others prosper. When he is burdened, unhappy, and in debt, and the prices of his products low and insufficient, all other branches of industry feel this blighting effect. For my part, I care not where the money comes from, whether from the large cities or the small cities and towns, so long as it comes legitimately into and is honestly paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

The farmers of the country are entitled to this new mail facility. They demand it, as they have a right to do, it being in accord with our modern life. The immediate results of rural free delivery are manifold and clearly apparent. It has stimulated social and business correspondence to a degree not anticipated even by its warmest friends, and it has added to the postal receipts very greatly during the brief period of its trial. Its introduction has been followed invariably by a large increase in the circulation of the press and the periodical literature, so desirable—indeed, so essential—to the present time. By it the farmer is brought into direct daily contact with the best thought of the day and the large industrial movements of the business world. He knows more about the markets and the varying prices than ever before. The producer is put into quick and ready communication with the consumer, and this great fund of information is brought to him by a new system, though enjoyed by the older countries of the world for many years. It brings him into a surer business status; it gives additional value to his crops and increases the value of his farm.

Good roads, which are so necessary to the maintenance of the rural free delivery, will become essential—the work of rural communities, if, indeed, the State and the nation do not undertake this great work. The material benefits of rural free delivery are both signal and unmistakable. I can not too strongly commend it. This great work of delivering the literature and the papers and the letters immediately upon receipt to the farmers will exercise a wide and potential influence upon our social and political life. It will become a factor in good government and stimulate American patriotism, for it can not be denied that loyalty to one's government, devotion to its interests, must be reciprocal, and when all classes of our people are treated alike, a higher degree of patriotism will become manifest and more direct interest in national affairs will be taken by all concerned.

It has been too much the disposition of the youth of our country to leave the farm where he was born and reared, around which so many delightful memories cluster, and where he has felt that his opportunities for growth and development were contracted because of his apparent isolation and removal from the sphere of business activity, and I can not too strongly emphasize the fact that this very work in which we are engaged—bringing the daily current of thought to the farmhouse—will have a tendency to check this disposition upon the part of many of the young farmers of our country.

There is no nobler vocation than that followed by the farmer, and it should be remunerative. His life should be made as happy as it is possible to make it, and when so existing he is the ideal citizen, and gets from life its greatest enjoyments and its most complete satisfaction. Rural free delivery will relieve the farm life of much of its monotony, and mitigate the difficulties experienced in the past. This is an educational system that we are inaugurating, full of promise and hope and encouragement. It will not be expensive. Indeed, I do not believe any expense within reason is too great to deter the execution of this plan so greatly desired by the farmers of our country.

The admirable commendation of this work by the Postmaster-General can be best expressed in his own words:

The benign influences of our free institutions diffuse themselves widely and impartially, but the arm of the Government is directly felt at few points. The mails attest the visible presence and service of the Government, and not least among the merits of the rural free delivery is its creation of the satisfying conviction in the farmer that he shares with the townsman the manifest advantages of which the Government is the direct minister. He feels that the organized and helpful agency of his country comes to his door, and the effect is to stir his conscious pride and stimulate his loyalty and patriotism.

With all these results clearly indicated by the experiment as thus far tried, rural free delivery is plainly here to stay. It can not be abandoned where it has been established, and it can not be maintained without being extended. It is a service in which there can be no backward step. Those who enjoy its advantages will not consent to surrender them, and every new route creates a demand from contiguous territory for the same privileges. We are thus confronted with the problem of gradually extending the delivery service over the whole area of the country where it is physically feasible or where the population is not so sparse as to make it unreasonable. A project of such comprehensive and colossal character may seem formidable and deterrent, but while its difficulties are not to be underestimated, they are shown, when examined in the light of practical tests, to be far from insurmountable.

We are now carrying the post-office to the door of 31,000,000 of people massed in towns and cities. The task before us is the more complicated work of carrying the post-office to the door of about 21,000,000, scattered over 1,000,000 square miles of territory. Its magnitude is not to be underestimated. England, France, and Germany make rural free delivery, their post-men going on foot. But England contains 30,867 square miles, France 204,062, and Germany 208,830. We are already covering with rural delivery a larger area than England, all effected within the past two years. By the end of the current fiscal year we shall reach one-sixth of the 21,000,000 to be served.

What has already been substantially accomplished is certainly capable of sixfold expansion.

On the 1st of July, 1899, there were 391 rural delivery routes in operation. Within the fiscal year, under an appropriation of \$450,000, this number was increased to 1,214. On the 1st of July, 1900, the appropriation of \$1,750,000 became available, and on the 15th of November 2,614 routes had been located and established, 61,979 miles in aggregate length, covering 66,842 square miles, divided among 44 States and Territories, and serving a population of 1,801,534. The number of applications pending at that date and awaiting action or under investigation was more than 2,100—nearly enough to double the existing service—and every day brings more. The close of the present fiscal year will see about 4,300 routes in operation, carrying the mail daily to the doors of not less than 3,500,000 residents of the rural districts.

If rural free delivery is to be accepted as a general policy, it is prudent to inquire into the probable cost of extending the service throughout the sections of the country favorable to its establishment. It must in the nature of the case be limited to those regions which topographically admit of its introduction and which are sufficiently settled to warrant it. Any calculation with the present data must be somewhat conjectural, but an approximate estimate may be reached. Surveying the country with reference to the density of the population and the character of the territory, and entering upon a detailed examination by States, it is believed that in the aggregate an area of about 1,000,000 square miles comprises all to which the service might reasonably be extended. Certainly it would take some years to cover that area, and it is all that need now be contemplated.

In arriving at an estimate of the gross cost there are three methods of computation. The first is to take as the basis the cost per square mile, the second the cost per capita, and the third the cost per county. On July 1, 1900, the rural delivery service covered an area of 30,756 square miles, with 1,276 routes. The cost per route, including the compensation of carrier and incidental expenses, but not administrative expense, is fixed at \$10. This makes the total cost for 1,276 routes, covering 30,756 square miles, \$650,760, or \$21.16 per square mile, or for a million square miles, \$21,160,000.

The second calculation is on the basis of population. The strictly rural population of the country varies little from 24,000,000. It is believed that upon a moderate estimate 3,000,000 of this number live in territory beyond the possible range of free delivery, leaving 21,000,000 within reach. The cost of the service, as it now exists, is 92.7 cents per capita. At this rate the cost for 21,000,000 people would be \$19,467,000.

The third computation takes the county as the basis. There are in the United States, excluding Alaska, 2,843 counties. Applying the same percentage, which on the best information obtainable was determinative of the area to be considered, it is found that 1,331 counties, or their equivalent, are suited to free delivery. The cost in Carroll County, Md., where a full county service is in operation, is \$23,500. In Washington County, Tenn., the cost is \$15,000. The average of the two is \$19,550. If they were fair samples this might be taken as a basis, but both counties are hilly, their physical subdivisions are irregular, and it is the opinion of special agents who have given the subject careful study that the cost is higher by one-third than it would be in counties of the Middle Western States, which are generally level, and where the roads are laid out on the section and quarter section lines. It is estimated that one-half of the 1,331 counties are of the latter class, and may be served at a cost one-third below the average of Carroll and Washington, or that the average cost for the whole would be one-sixth less. This would make the average cost per county \$15,800, or \$1,029,800 for the 1,331 counties.

These three methods of computation bring results which closely approach each other, and their average, \$20,555,000, may be accepted as a fairly approximate estimate of the gross annual cost of maintaining rural free delivery throughout the territory where it is reasonably feasible. But it presents only one side of the account. In order to ascertain the net cost of such a general extension it is necessary to deduct from this amount the savings effected by the discontinuance of other service which free delivery displaces, and the increased receipts it may be expected to bring. The sum of these items can only be inferred from the indications already given.

Where a solid county service has been established it dispenses with about 73 per cent of the fourth-class offices, and has done it with little friction at first and with full and hearty concurrence in the end. The substitution of carriers has allayed any discontent that has grown out of the abolition of the offices. If the proportion which has prevailed in the full county services thus far organized were to rule through a general extension of free delivery as above outlined, it would lead to the discontinuance of 39,420 offices, involving an annual saving, reckoning the average compensation at \$70, of \$2,759,400. On the same basis there would be a saving of \$2,500,000 through the discontinuance of star routes.

The increase of revenue which will be directly effected by free delivery, and which must be taken into account, can also be approximately calculated. The gross receipts of the postal service for the year ending June 30, 1900, were \$12,334,579.39. Of this amount \$82,193,061.96 came from Presidential offices, leaving \$39,159,487.33 as the receipts of the fourth-class offices. A critical examination of the reports shows that the increase in the revenues last year, outside of the free-delivery offices, was 2.49 per cent. But the increase in Carroll County after the establishment of rural delivery, even greater at first, was fully 10 per cent for the year, showing that an increment of 7.51 per cent can be credited directly to the introduction of this service.

The figures of other experiments confirm this calculation. Applying that percentage to the receipts of the last fiscal year outside of free-delivery offices, it points as the immediate fruit of the general extension of rural delivery to an increase in revenue of \$1,513,976.50. Indeed, this is believed to be a moderate estimate. As the extension would require a considerable period for its execution, the revenues would be constantly growing before its complete consummation, and the proportionate increase would be the greater. But taking the conservative exhibit, the net result of the extension of rural free delivery to 1,000,000 square miles, or all the eligible portion of the country, would stand thus:

Estimated gross cost	\$30,555,000
Deduct estimated savings from discontinuance of fourth-class offices of	\$2,759,400
Deduct estimated savings from discontinuance of star routes	2,500,000
Deduct increased receipts	1,513,976
	6,778,376
Net annual cost of rural free delivery	13,786,624

It thus appears that rural free delivery can be extended practically over the whole country at an annual cost of less than \$14,000,000. As the appropriation for the current fiscal year for this purpose is \$1,750,000, an additional outlay of \$12,000,000, unless unforeseen demands should come, would substantially take the mail every day to every door in the land. This assumes that the cost shall not exceed the present rate. If carrier service can be maintained at the existing compensation, it assures this limitation. With rigorous restraint the expenditures in this particular service can be restricted to the fixed boundaries, while the revenues will steadily advance. It will hardly be disputed that the great result of carrying the post-office to every home, if

it can be accomplished at such cost, or even greater, is an object well worth undertaking.

This duty is emphasized and enforced when we consider some other phases of the postal question. In my last annual report it was shown that if a class of publications which now, under an evasion of the purpose of the law, pay the second-class rate of postage, were really made to pay the third-class rate, as they ought to do, it would bring an additional revenue to the Government of \$12,361,612. This amount is lost through an abuse that can be and ought to be rectified. It is a public contribution without any public advantage for the sole benefit of a few private interests.

The cost to the Government of this abuse is almost exactly equivalent to the estimated cost of broad national rural free delivery; and if it is a question between favoring a very limited number of publishers and favoring 21,000,000 people who live on the farms of the United States, there ought to be no hesitation in serving the many rather than the few. The abuse should be uprooted as a public duty; the national delivery service should be undertaken as a public policy; and, when through the overthrow of the wrong the right can be established without the slightest additional burden, the appeal becomes irresistible.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SERVICE.

Yet while, as thus indicated, progress has been made in the United States, as in European countries, toward formulating a general system of extending the free delivery of mails to communities living remote from cities, it must be noted that our methods are not those of any other nation. They have been adapted, or rather they have adapted themselves, to the peculiar conditions of American life. There are strong points of divergence between the system of rural free delivery now being established (or which is establishing itself) in the United States and the methods of rural delivery which have prevailed in other countries for many years—in Great Britain, for instance, for over fifty years, and in France for a still longer period.

Ours is a cooperative plan. It comes up from the people. It is established upon petitions presented through their Representatives in Congress, irrespective of party affiliation, and those who desire it are expected to meet the Government halfway, by mending their roads, building bridges over their unbridged creeks and streams, and putting up secure and appropriate receiving boxes, so located on the roadside along the route traversed by the carrier that he can conveniently deposit or collect their mails within or therefrom without alighting from his vehicle. The service in other countries is bureaucratic, originating always with the post-office officials. It is laid down upon geometrical lines and adjusted by a tape measure.

PECULIARITIES OF EUROPEAN RURAL FREE DELIVERY.

The Secretary of State of the United States some time since, at the instance of Postmaster-General Gray, addressed to each of our ambassadors and ministers a request to obtain from the chief postal authorities of the governments to which they were accredited information as to the extent and character of the rural free-delivery service in their respective countries.

It was shown, for example, that in Great Britain there was substantially a house-to-house rural delivery, only the most inaccessible domiciles being left unvisited. The English rural postman, traveling chiefly on foot, walks from 15 to 18 miles a day, for an average pay of 18 shillings, or \$4.50 a week. A paternal government provides him a uniform, gives him \$5 a year to buy shoes, furnishes him medical attendance when sick, and permits him to retire on a small pension after ten years of faithful service.

In France rural carriers, who also travel on foot, are paid a mileage of 7½ centimes a kilometer, or not quite 2½ cents a mile, for the distance they cover. The average length of a route is from 10 to 15 miles, and they are required to cover it every day in the year, Sunday included. They receive an allowance for clothing and may retire on a pension at the end of fifteen years. The service extends into every commune, and practically all France is covered by rural free delivery.

In Germany the delivery of mails in remote rural districts is not exactly free. Extra postage is charged, part of which goes to the carrier and part to the Government. The pay of the carriers, outside of this allowance, is from 700 to 900 marks a year, with 100 marks additional for house rent (a German mark being equivalent to 24 cents of our money).

In Austria-Hungary the rural carrier is hired by the postmaster of the local office to which he is attached and paid by him. He is authorized to collect a fee of half a cent on all letters and an eighth of a cent on all newspapers delivered by him. His average pay is about \$120 a year. To earn this sum he travels 10 miles a day, always on foot. Before he can enter upon his duties he has to make a deposit of \$80 (or two-thirds of a year's salary) with the postmaster as security for carrying out his contract.

The Belgian rural carrier makes a daily round trip of 15 or 16 miles on foot, and is paid a salary which varies according to the supposed cost of living in the district where he serves, but which seldom exceeds \$250 a year. He is denied the right to vote and prohibited from taking part in politics.

WHAT CONSTITUTES RURAL FREE DELIVERY IN THE UNITED STATES.

It follows without saying that the rural free-delivery service with which the people of the United States have been made acquainted within the last three years is built upon none of these models. It is a sturdy, self-assertive service, with no paternalism about it. The carriers buy their own shoes and clothes, provide their own "rigs" and horses, pay their own doctors' bills, and vote as they please. Partisanship has been eliminated, as far as possible, from the rural free-delivery service. Requirement is made that each petitioner for rural free-delivery service, before being taken up for investigation, shall be recommended by the Representative in Congress from the district in which the proposed service is to start.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that this rural delivery service is experimental. I think it has passed out of that stage, and that it should be liberally provided for in the general appropriation for the Post-Office Department, in such a way as is calculated to make the work efficient and convenient. I believe it to be a fixture of the Post-Office Department. And why should it not be? The maximum amount required to give every farmer in this country the benefit of rural free mail delivery barely exceeds \$12,000,000 a year. If we can bring all the farmers of this country into closer touch with the centers of trade where they do business, if by this added facility we can relieve them of many burdens and much anxiety, in Heaven's name let us not hesitate to take this work up upon a permanent and substantial basis and make it what it can and should be.

It will be the most inexpensive yet most efficient and best appreciated branch of the public service. Wherever the routes have been tried in my Congressional district they give the utmost satisfaction, and I believe that it would be impossible to get the consent of any farmer upon any route there to cancel the service. It is

deemed most desirable from every point of view. France, England, and Germany have given this great advantage to their rural communities. Why should we hesitate? I am surprised at some of the opposition manifested here. Generally the men who oppose this great work do not represent the farmers of this country, and I believe that they are unappreciative of the fact that the business men of the large cities look with favor upon this new method. And at this point, Mr. Chairman, allow me to say that I do not believe the carriers upon these routes are sufficiently compensated for their services. They furnish their own horse and vehicle, and \$600 per year is not enough. I feel that they ought to get better pay.

Mr. BUTLER. They now get \$600.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I feel, too, that we ought to have a uniform vehicle for carrying and delivering this mail. The carriers are now vested with the additional responsibility of registering letters containing money and other valuables. The wagon used should comport with the dignity of the service performed. It should be covered and the carrier should be protected as far as possible from the inclemency of the weather, from the storms of winter and the heat of the summer's sun. I trust the Post-Office Department will give patient consideration to the question of the adoption of a vehicle specially adapted to this work; and, Mr. Chairman, I think after the vehicle has been adopted it would be well to have the Weather Bureau of the Government give to those carriers daily the predictions as to the weather for the following day, just as it is given to the mariners and sailors and the communities upon the seacoast and the Great Lakes.

It would not be difficult or expensive, and with the accuracy which has been attained by the Weather Bureau in making prophecies and predictions the farmer would have the advantage of twenty-four hours' notice as to what the weather may be. This would be a tremendous advantage to him, of incalculable value and effect, and I feel that some flag-signal service can be attached and made a part of rural-delivery work which will be inexpensive and yet serve the rural communities through which carriers pass with the weather prophecies and predictions daily sent out from that Bureau here in Washington.

I have great faith and confidence in the present administration of the Post-Office Department. It is thoroughly businesslike and responsive to the demands of the people. The heads of the Department are accommodating and ready to receive suggestions, even from the most humble, and I look for the time, not far distant, when the service of this Bureau will be the best of which man is capable. Furthermore, I think that the Committees on Post-Offices and Post-Roads are thoroughly alive to the importance of the Post-Office Department to the country, and that they will be liberal and public spirited in their recommendations.

Congress can with propriety indulge this branch of the Government service. A recommendation of three and one-half millions of dollars for the current year for rural delivery has been made, and were it not for the fact that that amount has been fixed upon I should favor a still larger sum in order that this blessing may not be longer withheld from those desirous of obtaining it. Inquiry at the Post-Office Department develops the fact that, in their judgment, wherever rural free mail delivery has been given its largest use it has been nearly self-sustaining, thus showing its limitless possibilities. But I do not care whether it is self-supporting or not. It is a natural and necessary auxiliary. The farmers of this country demand it. It is their right, and I favor it in their name [applause], as the Representative of a large agricultural district, thrifty and prosperous.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Michigan think it is fair to make clerks work in the city post-offices for \$15 and \$20 a month in order that the country may have rural free delivery or any other blessing of the Government?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I do not believe any clerks in the post-offices of any large city work for \$15 or \$20 a month. Such wages would be unfair, and the Post-Office Department is not administered upon such narrow lines. I am in favor of paying reasonable wages to all the servants of the Government, but I do not base my demand for rural free delivery upon any inequality in the wage scale that may exist in the Chicago post-office, or any other, which I presume the gentleman from Illinois has in mind. The Government can afford to pay good wages, and should do so, and the question of whether it does or not should have no influence whatever upon the question of giving the farmers of the country what they are justly entitled to—the delivery of their mail at their own doors, just as it is delivered at the doors of the humblest citizens of the city of Chicago, where the gentleman from Illinois resides.

I want the farmers of my district and State to have the same advantages with reference to the market reports, the daily papers, and the mail as is afforded to all other classes of our citizens, and I will not be content to allow them to be kept in ignorance of either the appreciation or depreciation of their products for an

unreasonable length of time when this information can be brought to their very doors by such a small expense as I have stated. We vote millions of dollars every year to our Army, our Navy, the Departments of Justice and of State; can we not economize in some one direction, or in all, and confer this priceless boon upon the farmers?

We are asked to vote large sums of money in aid of expositions, where the handiwork of our genius may be displayed for a few months to good advantage, and after the exposition is over the buildings are all destroyed and the only benefit lies in the permanent lodgment of the ideas there shown in the minds and hearts of the people contemporaneous with that event, but the service for which I am pleading will tend to brighten the home life of the farmer; will tend to greater enlightenment; will bring him into closer touch with the outside world. I do not ask it as a favor, I demand it as a right, earned over and over again by the farmer—the patient bearer of his country's burdens and the producer of much of its wealth. [Great applause.]

Naval Appropriation Bill—Building War Vessels at Navy-Yards.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. FITZGERALD,

OF NEW YORK.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 24, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13705) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes—

The Clerk read as follows:

INCREASE OF THE NAVY.

That for the purpose of further increasing the naval establishment of the United States, the President is hereby authorized to have constructed by contract two unsheathed seagoing battle ships, carrying the heaviest armor and most powerful ordnance for vessels of their class, upon a trial displacement of about 14,000 tons each, and to have the highest practicable speed and great radius of action, and to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not exceeding \$3,850,000 each; two unsheathed armored cruisers, carrying the heaviest armor and most powerful ordnance for vessels of their class, upon a trial displacement of about 14,000 tons each, and to have the highest practicable speed and great radius of action, and to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not exceeding \$4,000,000 each; and the contracts for the construction of each of said vessels shall be awarded by the Secretary of the Navy to the lowest best responsible bidder, having in view the best results and most expeditious delivery; and not more than one of said battle ships and not more than one of said armored cruisers herein provided for shall be built in one yard or by one contracting party; and in the construction of all said vessels all the provisions not inconsistent herewith of the act of June 7, 1900, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes," shall be observed and followed; and subject to the provisions hereinafter made, one and not more than two of the aforesaid battle ships and armored cruisers shall be built on or near the coast of the Pacific Ocean, or in the waters connecting therewith: *Provided*, That if it shall appear to the satisfaction of the President from the biddings for such contracts, when the same are opened and examined by him, that said vessels, or any of them, can not be constructed on or near the coast of the Pacific Ocean at a cost not exceeding 4 per cent above the lowest accepted bid for the other vessels provided for in this act, he shall authorize the construction of said vessels, or any of them, elsewhere in the United States, subject to the limitations as to cost hereinbefore provided.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, line 24, amend by inserting after the word "contract" "or in the navy-yards of the United States under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of the Navy."

Also, on page 63, line 11, after the word "and," insert "if by contract."

Also, on page 63, line 17, after the word "vessels," insert "built by."

Mr. DAYTON. I raise the question of order on the amendment. I do not quite comprehend the scope of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York on the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph just read provides under the title "Increase of the Navy" for the addition of four vessels to the Navy. The paragraph authorizes the President to have these vessels constructed by contract. This amendment is not subject to a point of order. It is neither new legislation within the meaning of the rule, nor does it change existing law. It is merely a limitation upon the power proposed to be given to the President. Under the language of this paragraph the power of the President to have these vessels constructed is limited. He is compelled to have them constructed "by contract."

This amendment empowers him to have them constructed either by contract or in the navy-yards of the United States. Had the

committee recommended that the President be authorized to have these vessels constructed without any restriction whatever upon his power, it would then have been in order to have amended the paragraph by limiting the power thus proposed to be given to him by restricting him to construction either by contract or in Government yards. The committee, however, does not propose to give the President unlimited power. The mere restriction by the committee of the President in one direction is no bar to efforts to limit it in another. The point of order is not good.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from New York has concluded, the Chair would be glad to hear from the gentleman from West Virginia on this question.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that, under existing law, the Secretary of the Navy is compelled to build these ships by contract. That is existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman refer the Chair to that law?

Mr. DAYTON. It is the law embodied in every one of the appropriation bills for a number of years. It goes back, I think, to 1887, when it was first provided that this should be done by contract. I want to call the Chair's attention further to the fact that at the last session of Congress the point of order was raised against the same provision and was sustained on the ground that it was new legislation and in opposition to existing law. And if the Chair will pardon me a moment, I think I can find the argument that was then had upon the question.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman labors under a misapprehension when he says that there is a law in existence which applies to the vessels authorized in this bill. In this bill itself is contained the reenactment of the law which heretofore has regulated contracts for the construction of new ships. The paragraph now under consideration provides that the vessels therein authorized shall be built by contract. There is the authority to build by contract. Further on in this paragraph it is provided that the provisions of a former act shall apply to the construction of these vessels.

So far as these vessels are concerned that is not yet a law. It will not be until this bill passes. That portion of the paragraph may be stricken out. If this amendment be adopted and the President, under the authority then given to him, shall direct that some of these vessels be built in the navy-yards, then any provisions of this bill that regulate the letting of contracts for the building of vessels will apply only to the vessels built by contract and not to those built in Government yards.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment differs materially from that which was offered last year and to which reference has been made in the discussion to-day. The decision upon that amendment is not applicable to the question raised here. In the last session, while the naval bill was under consideration, I offered an amendment which provided that certain vessels authorized in that bill should be constructed under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Navy "in such navy-yards of the United States as were best adapted therefor." The amendment was offered at a place in the bill different from that at which the pending amendment is offered. Moreover, this amendment makes nothing compulsory upon the President. It merely places in his discretion power to direct that some of the vessels here authorized be built in these navy-yards. It is a mere limitation upon his power.

This provision of the bill is entirely new. It authorizes the construction of four vessels. There is no law yet in existence which provides for the construction of these vessels. Under this bill as reported by the committee the power of the President to have the vessels here authorized constructed is limited. By the insertion in this provision of the words "by contract" he is not given authority to have them built in the way he believes best. He is limited to the contract method. This amendment is merely a further limitation of his power. It makes it discretionary with him to have them built either by contract or in navy-yards. It is not mandatory. It does not come within the ruling cited last year in the case where it was provided that certain vessels could be built only in those private yards which had certain equipments and not more than a certain number of vessels under construction.

If the Chair will refer to the ruling made in the last session, when the naval bill was under consideration, he will see that the amendment then under consideration was held to be obnoxious to the rule, because it provided that the vessels should be constructed in the navy-yards "best adapted therefor." But this amendment contains no such language.

The CHAIRMAN. From what page in the RECORD is the gentleman reading?

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. The amendment offered in the last session is found on page 4492, Part V of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I will send it up if the Chair desires it. That amendment was offered, as the Chair will see from inspection, to come in at a different place. It was so constructed that it applied directly to the vessels authorized in that bill.

Mr. DAYTON. I want to ask the gentleman a single question in that connection. Do you undertake to say that the Secretary of the Navy can now under this bill build ships in the navy-yard?

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. No; for this reason: Certain vessels have been authorized in certain appropriation bills—I do not remember now how many are authorized—

Mr. DAYTON. But I mean under the law providing that no work exceeding \$1,000 shall be done except under contract after advertisement.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. The Secretary of the Navy can not do anything without the authority of Congress. In the last appropriation bill a certain number of vessels were authorized to be constructed by contract. That bill provided that the provisions of the act of 1887 should apply to the construction of those vessels.

This bill instead of setting forth in full the provisions of the act of 1887 reenacts it by providing that the provisions of that act (setting forth its title) shall be in force so far as the vessels here authorized are concerned. If this bill were to pass without that specific direction, however, the provisions of the act of 1887 would not control the President in contracting for the vessels here authorized. The act of 1887 would not control the action of the President in building these vessels unless, as it is proposed to be done in this bill, its provisions are specifically made applicable. The law is not yet made. It is merely under consideration. The purpose of this amendment is to exempt some of these vessels from the provisions of the act of 1887, as proposed to be reenacted.

The gentleman does not seem to be very familiar with the provisions of that act. It was a special bill that provided for the building of vessels for the Navy. Under its provision the Secretary of the Navy was authorized in those cases in which satisfactory contracts could not be made for the building of all or any of the vessels to build them in Government yards. It was not a general act. It was a special act, and its provisions related only to the vessels therein authorized. It was carefully prepared, and many of the details of the contracts that the Secretary of War was authorized to make were distinctly set forth. From year to year the provisions of that act have been reenacted, just as it is proposed to do in this paragraph by reference to the last general appropriation bill in which new vessels were authorized. The result has been that all vessels built by contract since then have been practically subjected to the same requirements.

The CHAIRMAN. It is suggested to the Chair that section 3709 of the Revised Statutes is the permanent law regulating this subject. The Chair would be glad to hear from the gentleman from New York on the subject.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. What is the section?

The CHAIRMAN. The section is this:

All purchases and contracts for supplies or services in any of the departments of the Government, except for personal services, shall be made by advertisement, etc.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. That is where the contract has been authorized; but no contract for the building of these vessels has been authorized. If the Chair will really look at the bill itself, he will see the bill provides that the President is "hereby authorized to have constructed by contract." There is where the authorization to contract for these vessels is contained, and this amendment limits his power. It is a limitation upon his power. There is no general law that provides that all vessels authorized for the Navy shall be built by contract. I make no question that if these vessels are to be built by contract that law applies.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from West Virginia any further general law bearing upon this question?

Mr. DAYTON. Not at this time. I have the impression that in one of the appropriation bills some time in the past it has been provided that the vessels shall be built by contract. I remember when the question came up last year I regarded it as *res adjudicata*, and hence have not looked the matter up since.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. This is an entirely different amendment. We tried to avoid the trouble of last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York seeks to amend this section in such a way that the President be authorized to construct these ships enumerated in the section either by contract or in the navy-yards of the United States. The provision reported by the committee only authorizes the construction of the ships by contract. There has been no general law suggested to the Chair which would be altered by the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York. The Chair, therefore, is compelled to think that it is in order, in the absence of any such statute, and therefore overrules the point of order. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. I would like to speak to the amendment. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not present a novel question. During the last session of Congress the question of building some of the vessels authorized for the Navy in the Government yards was quite thoroughly discussed. Unfortunately

it was impossible to have the House vote directly upon the question. A point of order made against the amendment then offered was sustained by the Chair.

The Committee on Naval Affairs in the last session had before them four or five of the most competent constructors of the Navy. All of these men expressed the opinion that it would be economical for the Government to build some of the war vessels at navy-yards. At that time they were convinced of the advisability of such action.

In the discussion upon the naval bill during the last session, I submitted a statement, Mr. Chairman, of the work done in Government yards in other countries. It is really astounding to learn that in England, France, Germany, Italy, and in Russia from 25 per cent to 60 per cent of the vessels under construction for the several navies are being built in the Government yards. Yet in seventeen years this country has utilized its magnificent naval stations for the construction of but four vessels.

It was urged in this House that the yards would be so busy repairing vessels that it would be impossible for new work to be undertaken in them. At that time I pointed out the fallacy of that proposition. Six million dollars were appropriated at the last session for repairs to war vessels. Yet, Mr. Chairman, in the principal navy-yard of this country, located at Brooklyn, within a few months of the passage of that bill, hundreds of men were thrown out of employment by reason of the lack of work. Unless vessels require repairs, no appropriations, however large, can keep yards properly filled with work.

The object of building in the navy-yards is not to cripple private plants. Efficiency of force and economy in its maintenance are the ends sought. It is well known that permanence of employment secures labor more cheaply than temporary work. There seems to be some fear that this proposition involves large increases in the forces employed at the various navy-yards. These navy-yards are most cheaply maintained when most fully utilized. It is idle to expect that plants with a capacity of from two to three thousand men can be economically operated with only half their proper force employed.

Continuity of employment is recognized in all establishments as essential to the highest degree of efficiency. Men constantly employed together become well drilled and organized and are thus capable of doing more and better work. The temptation to drag out work would not be present with constant employment in view, as it is when men are taken on merely for temporary purposes. It is not human for men to work themselves out of a job. With new work constantly in these yards, equipped as they are to handle it, repair work, when it comes, will be economically and expeditiously done. This is the unanimous opinion of the constructors examined by the Naval Committee last session.

I will not quote at length, Mr. Chairman, from the testimony taken before the Naval Committee during the first session of this Congress. In the discussion in this House upon the naval appropriation for the present fiscal year that testimony was used in extenso.

Evidence of the advantages to be derived from building in Government yards constantly multiplies. On the 15th of March, 1900, Mr. W. L. Capps, naval constructor, United States Navy, appeared before the House Committee on Naval Affairs for the purpose of giving his views upon the advisability of sheathing ships. I quote from that hearing the following, as it seems to have been overlooked in previous discussions of the question now under consideration:

Mr. WHEELER. The committee has been considering the advisability of constructing some of our ships by the Government in our navy-yards, and I would like to know what you think about it.

Mr. CAPPS. I believe in it to a limited degree, my reason being that although the first cost will probably be more than in a private yard, there are some decided advantages to be derived from such a practice. It is very evident why it should cost more, because the Government pays for eight hours' labor about the same price paid by private firms for nine or ten hours' work, in addition to full pay for all national holidays. It may be assumed that the intelligence of management will be the same, that the mechanics would be equal in skill, and the cost of plant, etc., would be eliminated, so that under a proper and economical administration the cost of work in a Government yard should be very little in excess of that in a private yard. The tremendous advantage to be gained by having a small amount of work always available in a yard is in keeping the force in an efficient condition. You can get and retain good men, by constant employment, and when vessels come in for emergency repairs, instead of being dependent upon contractors—who, it is well known, make very great profits in repair work; in fact, that is their most profitable work, since it is in the nature of emergency work and must be done, and profits of 50 per cent are not unusual in some parts of the world—the work can be quickly and efficiently done by a trained force in a Government yard. Government ships can be sent there at any time and be properly taken care of without making any contracts at all; you have your own force, and the work is done in the best possible way.

Mr. WHEELER. Then, as I understand you, you think it would be better wisdom for the Government to construct at least part of its ships all the time in its own yards?

Mr. CAPPS. I do.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. For the reason of increasing the efficiency?

Mr. CAPPS. Increasing the efficiency and, in case of temporary lack of repair work, enabling you to maintain your organization, so that the yard will be at all times ready to do any sort of work regardless of outside combinations.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. In your judgment, would that character of efficiency

be maintained by repairs if the different navy-yards were continued right along consecutively, so as to maintain a regular force there from one year's end to the other?

Mr. CAPPS. Yes; if repairs were continuous the argument that building in yards is necessary to maintain an organization would not apply—

Mr. VANDIVER. Is it possible to do that when the emergency for repairs does not continue consecutively?

Mr. CAPPS. No; experience has demonstrated it is not possible.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. But does not that continue. Are we not continually having vessels to repair?

Mr. CAPPS. Yes; but the work is not uniform in quantity. In some seasons you have use for 1,000 workmen, at others you may reduce them to 500.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Is not the increased lot of workmen on repairs due to outside influences?

Mr. CAPPS. I should say not; it ought not to be, decidedly.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Is not it a fact whenever a vessel comes for repairs at a navy-yard where there are three or four hundred men employed, and who could make repairs to that vessel in a time perhaps spread over three months, is it not a fact that outside pressure is brought to bear to secure the employment of outside people, and that the force is immediately raised to eight or nine hundred?

Mr. CAPPS. I should say decidedly not. If the charge of outside pressure could be sustained, and the additional men were not needed to carry on the work expeditiously in order to complete it on time, then the responsible authorities are guilty of malfeasance in office.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I do not so consider it.

Mr. CAPPS. If you employ men not needed?

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I do not say that. I said that force was increased whereby the work was completed within a month and a half, where with the regular force it would have taken three months. There is no malfeasance in office there.

Mr. CAPPS. That is an entirely different matter. My experience does not lead me to believe that is the case, however.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I am rather inclined to think, so far as my observation goes as to the employment at navy-yards, that is in a measure the case.

Mr. CAPPS. I think, rather, it is this way: When several vessels are sent to a navy-yard at the same time, if there is no immediate need for their services you could employ only your permanent force and spread the work over a space of four or five months and repair them all; but during that time, if there were real need for the services of these vessels, you would have possibly several million dollars' worth of property lying idle because the repairs could not be completed in time by the permanent force, and in that case you would have to take in more men in order to do the work in a reasonable time.

Mr. HAWLEY. You stated that in some parts of the world the approximate profit estimated or calculated for repairing ships would probably equal 50 per cent?

Mr. CAPPS. Yes; in several cases which came under my personal observation I am quite sure that the profit was not less than 50 per cent.

Mr. HAWLEY. What is your estimate of the profit that is expected or sought by American repair shops?

Mr. CAPPS. It is a thing you can only give an opinion about, because the books of cost are usually inaccessible, but my belief is they will make ordinarily 20 to 30 per cent on repair work.

Mr. HAWLEY. If you were constructing a vessel or vessels in any yards in our country, with a full force of trained artisans in all the departments which have to do with construction of ships, and were suddenly called on to make the repairs to a large ship, or a number of ships, and you had this working force at your command, what, in your judgment, would be the percentage of the difference in cost to the Government doing it under the conditions that I have named in your own yards or having it done by private yards?

Mr. CAPPS. Under thoroughly efficient management and using your permanent force?

Mr. HAWLEY. Under the conditions I have just named.

Mr. CAPPS. The time limit comes in. Do you wish this work done in a very brief time, or do you mean working your present force to its full capacity?

Mr. HAWLEY. We want it done in such time as would operate to the greatest advantage of the Government in the economy of the repair work which is made.

Mr. CAPPS. Then you would not increase your force; you would work your normal force to its full capacity.

Mr. HAWLEY. Simply call them off from some other work and put them on this work?

Mr. CAPPS. Yes; the taking on of new men means an increase of expense.

Mr. HAWLEY. I put my question very clearly so you would understand that the workmen who were to be employed in these repair works were workmen you had regularly there in the construction of ships, and you would call them away from that work for the time being in order to make those repairs. What would be the difference in the per cent of cost to the Government under those circumstances and the charge made by private shops?

Mr. CAPPS. I would not venture to give you an exact percentage.

Mr. HAWLEY. I can understand that.

Mr. CAPPS. It should cost less to do the work in a Government yard.

Mr. HAWLEY. Based on your experience?

Mr. CAPPS. Yes. It ought to be less in a Government yard than in a private yard.

Mr. HAWLEY. Would it be safe for the Government to undertake for the sake of those repairs—largely for that reason—to begin the construction of ships in those yards?

Mr. CAPPS. Yes; because not only is the cost less, but the quality of the work is better, and it is better simply because your workmen have no incentive to do work otherwise than in the best manner, and in private yards there is some incentive to slur over repair work in order to do it cheaply.

Mr. HAWLEY. In your reply have you considered the element which is a factor of this matter—the difference between the eight hours for the Government and the ten hours for the private yards?

Mr. CAPPS. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. And you still can do it for less money?

Mr. CAPPS. Yes; I believe so. The difference in the length of working day is practically offset by having the plant free. If you are going to charge up the cost of the plant, that is an entirely different matter.

Mr. METCALF. Is it not a fact that on all repairs in private construction they charge the men up by the hour?

Mr. CAPPS. Yes.

Mr. METCALF. So much an hour?

Mr. HAWLEY. On that very point, is it not true that the Government really pays the same price for the same character of labor for eight hours as the private yards pay for ten hours?

Mr. CAPPS. Practically.

Mr. HAWLEY. That seems to me to bring the question right back to its original proposition.

Mr. CAPPS. It is nine hours in some yards instead of ten, as against the Government's eight hours.

Mr. HAWLEY. I can understand it is difficult to make any accurate statement, because conditions are varying all the time, but your judgment is that after all your experience in naval work, for the sake of repair work alone in the different yards, particularly with the increased work which the Navy must now have, that it would be largely advantageous for Congress to provide for the construction of more or less ships in our own yards?

Mr. CAPPS. I do.

Mr. HAWLEY. My question I tried to make plain—that, for the sake of repair work alone, that the economy of that work alone if the ships cost the same money, dollar for dollar, in the Government yards that they would cost in the private yards, that still, for the sake of repair work, by reason of the expedition which can be given to important work, you would have these yards maintained on a basis that would enable you to build ships in the navy-yards as well as to do this repair work?

Mr. CAPPS. Yes.

The same conclusions are reached by practically all the constructors in the Navy. They all advocate the building of new vessels in yards, believing that the interests of the Government and therefore the people will best be served by such a policy.

It seems peculiar that the Committee on Naval Affairs in its reports ignores completely this proposition. Last year, although days were spent in taking testimony upon this question, not a single word was to be found about it in the very voluminous report presented by the committee to the House. The question was completely ignored. This year the committee has pursued the same policy. So far as its reports are concerned it would be impossible to know that the subject had ever been broached.

This has not been due, Mr. Chairman, to any dereliction on the part of the officials charged with the duty of advising the committee and Congress. In the annual report of Rear-Admiral Philip Hichborn, Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, this matter is carefully considered. Admiral Hichborn is about to retire after forty years of service in the Navy. No one questions his great ability. He is competent from years of study and experience intelligently to advise upon such questions. To insure this House, having before it his arguments, I will read that portion of his report, as it is very brief, which deals with this question:

BUILDING VESSELS IN NAVY-YARDS.

Much has been said both in favor of and against the building of vessels in the navy-yards. The progress made in the improvement of yard plants and the ever-increasing need for a permanent skilled force ready for and capable of at all times taking up repairs of any character which the growth in "matériel" of the Navy entails make it desirable that the question should be given careful consideration. There is at the present time, in view of the prosperous condition of the shipbuilding industry and the number of naval vessels building and appropriated for, sufficient work to permit the assignment of a portion of the building work to the Government yards without there being a question of the withdrawal or withholding of necessary support and assistance, through work given out, to a private industry, the maintenance of which in a high state of efficiency is unquestionably of national importance.

These conditions make it possible to eliminate from the discussion any questions of policy except such as affect economy and efficiency. It has been the history of all the iron and steel navies in existence to-day that the building of the vessels was at first entirely confided to private industry, and that the existence of the nucleus of a steel fleet made it necessary that the governments who were their owners should themselves provide for repairing these vessels, and that, having provided the necessary plant for this purpose, the provision for the maintenance of the equally necessary though vastly more difficult thing to attain, viz, efficient working organization and adequate efficient personnel, forced them to undertake in their navy-yards a portion of the new building work. The extent to which this is being done by the principal naval powers may be seen by the table below:

Nation.	Number of Government navy-yards in which building is carried on.	Number of battle ships building in Government yards.	Number of armored cruisers building in Government yards.	Number of other cruising vessels.
England.....	5	8	5	3
France.....	6	3	10	4
Germany.....	3	3	1	4
Russia.....	2	3	1	2
Italy.....	2	1	2

In the case of many of the European nations—for example, Denmark and Holland, maintaining smaller navies—so strongly is this necessity for a permanent efficient navy-yard personnel felt that practically all the naval building work undertaken by them is carried out at their navy-yards. What they have done and are doing is mentioned here solely to emphasize the fact that the unanimous testimony of experience has been and is that the execution of a certain amount of building work at the chief Government yards is necessary to the maintenance of such navy-yard staffs as a complete and efficient naval organization requires; and that, whatever disadvantages such a course entails, they are more than compensated for in the end. It is believed that we have reached that stage in a naval development—still considerably behind our national development—which forces upon us serious consideration of this step which other naval powers have found necessary and expedient.

At the outset the disadvantages to be labored under will be considerable. Time and experience will do much toward the alleviation or possibly the entire removal of many of these. While, under existing conditions, in the case of the first vessels built in our navy-yards it may be expected that the cost will not be greatly different from—may even be somewhat greater than for—the same work executed by contract in the private shipyards, the Bureau believes that such a course once entered upon would demonstrate its desirability and practicability in an increased efficiency and economy in naval administration, regarded as a whole, without interference with a judicious policy of such Government encouragement of the shipbuilding industry as will keep the greatest number of establishments in a position to undertake and execute promptly any naval work which may be required.

It is well known, Mr. Chairman, that at times naval constructors have been at their wits' ends to devise employment in order that their forces should not be completely disorganized. The shipyards of this country are not many. They are scattered along the coasts. Workmen can not afford to shift frequently from place to place. They desire to settle wherever employment promises to be most continuous. As I pointed out last year, in 1845 Lord Brassey, probably the greatest authority on this question that Great Britain has ever produced, stated that it was necessary to keep men constantly employed in order to secure the best results.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. I ask unanimous consent to continue my remarks.

Mr. FOSS. I call for a vote. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that he may continue his remarks for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. DAYTON. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Division, Mr. Chairman!

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 59, noes 72.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. I ask for tellers.

The question was taken, and tellers were ordered; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS] were appointed tellers.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported 66 ayes and 72 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The St. Louis World's Fair.

"An enterprise conceived in patriotism, born of truly national instincts, and projected for the progress, the enlightenment, the peaceful advancement, and the material welfare of the American people and the people of the world."

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, February 18, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 9829) to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory by the United States by holding an international exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, mine, forest, and sea in the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT said:

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no particular reason why I should advocate the passage of the pending measure any more ardently than any other member of this House. The St. Louis World's Fair is the concern of every citizen of this country, and, consequently, of every member of Congress, as much as it is mine and that of my colleagues from St. Louis and Missouri.

It is true my city is to furnish the location for the great exposition, but that location was chosen, not by us, but by a convention of delegates whom the governors of fifteen different States and Territories had sent to St. Louis. That convention met in January, 1899, to decide whether and how the centennial of the Louisiana purchase should be celebrated. After several days of earnest deliberation it was unanimously agreed that an international exposition, second to none ever held anywhere on the globe, should be held in the metropolis of the Mississippi Valley in the centennial year of 1903, the convention assigning as a reason that no other plan would be commensurate with the importance of the great historical event it was proposed to commemorate. Our citizens reluctantly assumed the great obligation, not only in behalf of St. Louis, or Missouri, or the States and Territories comprised in the purchase, but in behalf of the whole country.

The acquisition of the Louisiana territory is the proudest achievement of American statesmanship, and the unparalleled development of the vast empire west of the Mississippi River is the wonder of the nineteenth century. It is the most eloquent evidence of the triumph and glory of American institutions, tending to lift us up with pride and to thrill the heart of every true American from Maine to California and from Canada to the Gulf. What but a world's fair is adequate to the occasion of this great cen-

tennial? Would you erect a monument or open a historical museum? Would you publish the contract between Jefferson and Napoleon in the newspapers, or shoot off firecrackers, or sing hymns in the churches?

All this and more could be and no doubt will be arranged for, and yet your constituents and mine would justly ridicule our pusillanimity. We could make the anniversary of the day when ratifications of the purchase were exchanged a national holiday, and we would still be far from coming up to the just expectations of the American people. No; I would be greatly mistaken in the temper of our people if they were satisfied with anything less than what we propose to do in the pending bill.

It is a national undertaking, in the best sense of the word. There is no local feature connected with it except that the exposition must be held somewhere, and there is no difference of opinion, I believe, that it should be held in some locality within the confines of the Louisiana purchase. St. Louis is the largest city in that vast territory. She will have large revenues during the time of the exposition, true, but do not let us forget that she makes still larger sacrifices. While the nation is asked to contribute \$5,000,000, St. Louis puts up \$10,000,000, to commemorate an event which is really the whole nation's concern, and not hers. There is not a city in the wide world, except in the United States, which could raise \$5,000,000 by voluntary subscriptions; and I go still further and say it is doubtful whether to-day you could find another city in this country which would undertake it, and, besides, be willing to vote additional \$5,000,000 as an assessment upon her taxable property. We have done it. Public spirit and civic pride have accomplished it. For two long years we have been gathering subscriptions, and the sum total of time and energy spent upon the task by our citizens and the sacrifices made by them have perhaps never been surpassed in times of peace anywhere and at any period in the history of the world's municipalities.

To-day I stand here, Mr. Speaker, and can proudly say in behalf of the citizenship of St. Louis and St. Louis County, "We have done our part; we have fulfilled our contract. We have raised \$10,000,000, and tender this enormous sum to the nation as an offering upon the altar of patriotism." In European countries the national governments usually defray the largest part of exposition expenditures, but here in this case one American city proposes to carry two-thirds of the burden herself. It is unnecessary, perhaps, to remind the members of the House of the fact that last summer a contract was entered into between the United States and the people of St. Louis. By a provision contained in the sundry civil bill, and which passed both Houses by large majorities, it was stipulated that if St. Louis would raise \$10,000,000 for the contemplated exposition, Congress would aid the undertaking to the extent of \$5,000,000. The Secretary of the Treasury was designated as arbiter, and that official has now certified, as appears from the report so ably presented by the distinguished chairman of the special committee having this matter in charge, that St. Louis has fully performed her part of the contract. Nothing, then, remains to be done but that Congress carry out its promise and keep its pledge.

In view of these facts it seems to me that even those who from constitutional scruples oppose appropriations of this kind should no longer withhold their support. The time to urge constitutional objections was when the original contract was entered into, but to-day the question before us is of an entirely different character. It is not whether \$5,000,000 shall be appropriated, but whether or not Congress will keep faith with the people of St. Louis and will fulfill a moral if not a legal obligation. That is the only question we are now called upon to decide. The pending measure, therefore, appeals not to our judgment as to a policy, but to our consciences and to the honor of Congress and the nation.

It is the first time, Mr. Speaker, that St. Louis knocks at the doors of Congress for such a purpose. We now ask the nation to lend its aid and encouragement to an enterprise conceived in patriotism, born of truly national instincts, and projected for the progress, the enlightenment, the peaceful advancement, and the material welfare of the American people and the people of the world.

Is the occasion worthy of the magnitude of the project? Let the historian answer the question. He says the Louisiana purchase was an event second in importance only to the Declaration of Independence and the foundation of the Government itself. It settled once for all the question of European power and possessions south of the forty-fifth—aye, forty-ninth—degree of northern latitude and made the Americans lords and masters of the continent forever. What if France or Spain or England had succeeded in retaining possession of nearly all the territory west of the Mississippi, if Napoleon had not sold it to Jefferson, or if the Federalists of that day had succeeded in their opposition to the purchase? I leave it to the imagination of the members to picture to themselves the possible or even probable results. The country had hardly recovered from the effects of the Revolutionary war. Would it have been equal to the emergency of a second conflict of arms with a

great European power? Such a war would, perhaps, have been inevitable; but if it had occurred, the contract price would undoubtedly have been more than a hundred times that paid by Jefferson to Napoleon Bonaparte. To-day we regard that price—\$15,000,000—merely nominal, but at that time the Federalists in Congress made it the pretext of a most bitter opposition to Jefferson's great expansion act.

Listen to what they said. It is interesting in the light of the twentieth century. "Fifteen millions of dollars!" they would exclaim. "The sale of a wilderness has not usually commanded a price so high. Ferdinand Gorges received but £1,250 for the province of Maine. William Penn gave for the wilderness that now bears his name but a trifle over £5,000. Fifteen millions of dollars! A breath will suffice to pronounce the words. A few strokes of the pen will express the sum on paper." But not one man in a thousand, they argued, has any conception of the magnitude of the amount. Weigh it, and there will be 433 tons of solid silver; load it into wagons, and there will be 866 of them; place the wagons into line, giving 3 rods to each, and they will cover a distance of 5½ miles; stack it up, dollar on dollar, and, supposing 9 to make an inch, the pile will be more than 3 miles high; it would pay an army of 25,000 men 40 shillings a week for twenty-five years; it would, divided among the population of the country, give \$3 for each man, woman, and child; invest the principal as a school fund, and the interest will support forever 1,800 free schools, allowing 50 scholars and \$500 to each school. For whose benefit is this purchase made? The South and the West. Will they pay a share of the debt? No; for the tax on whisky has been removed. Federal writers all over the land were vying with each other in attempts to show the people what an exceedingly great sum of money \$15,000,000 was. Some affected to consider the purchase of foreign territory unconstitutional in the extreme, and even President Jefferson was first inclined to take that narrow view, until his common sense got the better of his political scruples. Others were worried lest the East should become depopulated; lest a great emigration should set in; lest old men and young men, abandoning homes and occupations, should cross the Mississippi and perhaps found there a republic of their own. Some, again, feared that mere extent of territory would rend the Republic apart; that no common ties of interest could ever bind together under one government men who fought Indians and trapped bears around the head waters of the Missouri and men who built ships and caught fish in the harbors of the Atlantic coast.

Statistics and arguments, most happily, were of no avail. The mass of the people pronounced the purchase a bargain. The Senate ratified the treaty and conventions, and on December 20, 1803, Louisiana was peaceably taken possession of by the United States. Wisdom, patriotism, and broad-gauged statesmanship had triumphed over sophistry and factions, and in 1803, at St. Louis, we will all bend our knees and thank the Lord for this glorious victory of American common sense.

Does the present generation fully realize the wonders of the metamorphosis these hundred years have wrought in that vast, then uninhabited, domain beyond the Father of Waters? To the Americans of that day it was an unknown land. Not a boundary was defined. Not a scrap of trustworthy information concerning the region was to be obtained, only meager accounts of what travelers had seen on the Missouri, of what hunters and trappers knew of the Upper Mississippi, of what the Indians said were the features of the great plains that stretched away toward the setting sun. The history of the human race furnishes no example to equal the miraculous change wrought here in a single century. Immigration furnished the substance and liberty the force of this unparalleled development of the 13 States and 2 Territories comprised in the domain of the Louisiana acquisition. To-day Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, and Indian Territory constitute an empire with at least four times the population of the 13 original States under Jefferson, and with room for tens of millions to come.

Let us look for a moment at the next World's Fair in its international aspect. It is a fascinating thought and a most interesting picture to contemplate. We need not strain our imagination to arrive at the conclusion that the international features of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition will in proportion vastly exceed, and in determined effort on the part of foreign participants greatly excel, anything heretofore seen on this continent. The reasons are technical and commercial as well as political.

First, we must add a whole decade of progress to the wonders seen in the White City on Lake Michigan, and considering that nearly all civilized nations have progressed as we have, the sum total of achievements in industry, science, and art recorded since the Columbian Exposition is almost bewildering. Foreign participation is, of course, not prompted by sentiment, but by the almighty dollar. We buy \$1,000,000,000 worth every year from the outside world, and this American custom is the great and irre-

sistible magnet which will attract the manufacturers and artists of the whole globe to our fair. So strong is this attraction that it will easily overcome the alleged drawback in the shape of our July and August weather. The sun, I believe, will have no terrors for the man who is after the American dollar. Incidentally, let me say in this connection that the cool air by means of which we shall render our exposition palaces comfortable will in itself be an instructive illustration of the world's progress.

But besides these commercial considerations there is a political reason which must be regarded as a hopeful omen of success. Our great undertaking will be popular in Europe and elsewhere, because its sanction by Congress and the President is a message of peace to the world. Of late we have dabbled, so to speak, in war, and our enemies in Europe, aided by Democratic politicians on this side, have set up the claim that the American Republic would henceforth compete with the monarchies of the Old World in wars of aggression and conquest. Although the Liberals and Republicans of England, France, and Germany bravely combated this assertion, yet some of them had their misgivings about the matter, and during the great peace conference of parliamentarians, held at Christiania, Norway, in July, 1899, at least a dozen representatives of as many nations privately expressed their fears to me.

"If it were true," said a well-known member of the German Reichstag, "that the United States had taken up war as a business, it would be a blow to the cause of republicanism in Europe from which it would not recover in a hundred years." I did my best, of course, to reassure my friends, and suggested that if they knew the American people a little better, doubts as to their peaceful intents and purposes would never enter their minds. But no more effective reassurance on this score could have been given the friends of peace and liberty of Europe than the \$5,000,000 appropriation by Congress for the St. Louis World's Fair. No national legislature, not even ours, has ever contributed as much in one lump sum for a project which can not succeed except amidst the blessings of peace. This action of Congress will cause general rejoicing among the friends of international peace all over the world, not only because of its general significance, but also because the legislative council of that conference, upon my motion, had unanimously decided to hold the 1903 meeting in the city of St. Louis. This, by the way, assures us the first great world's congress, and undoubtedly there will be others. Perhaps the President and Secretary Hay can be induced to invite the governments of the earth for a further consultation, with a view to permanently substituting arbitration for war, and thus to crown the great Louisiana Exposition with the glory of an achievement which will deserve and receive the blessings of all mankind.

Within the next few weeks President McKinley will notify all foreign governments of the action of Congress. Just watch how readily they will all respond. The Spanish-American war was, perhaps, not a big affair as a military operation, but it has wrought a remarkable readjustment of European opinion concerning us. All travelers abroad agree that, while Europeans never loved Uncle Sam, and do not now, they at least "respect" him, and are actuated by a cordial desire to be on good terms with him. His appearance on the stage of action has had the effect of relegating to the rear the Turkish, Oriental, and many other questions which have exercised European diplomacy for so many years, and of causing each power to observe strict neutrality, to confine itself to its own sphere of influence, and to await developments. The old bones of contention have dwindled into insignificance as compared with the new Oriental questions in which the results of the Spanish war have forced the United States to take a hand. Up to two years ago it was regarded a promotion for a German diplomat to be sent from Washington to Constantinople. To-day I know the reverse to be the case, which speaks volumes for the changed condition of things.

And now that Uncle Sam, instead of walking around with a chip on his shoulder, as Europe feared he would do, extends the glad hand of welcome to all the world for the purpose of an exhibition of the victories of peace, the effect can be none other than a ready and general acceptance of the invitation.

I suggest, however, that in the course of time our call upon the nations of the earth may be supplemented by a cordial invitation of rulers. Their desire to visit this wonderful country is without doubt a strong one, and with the modern means of transportation enlightened public opinion would nowhere regard it as derogatory to their dignity if they embraced such a splendid opportunity to see the New World. They are fully aware that their subjects have long ceased to believe them endowed with omniscience, hence such a visit could well be justified even from the standpoint of statesmanship, which requires the crowned heads to be well posted, in the interest of their own people, on the conditions of all nations and countries. While in Berlin last year a high official of the foreign office said, when I mentioned the matter to him, he had no doubt that the novel idea of a visit to America would undoubtedly impress the Emperor, and while such a visit was un-

probable, nobody could venture to say that it was among the impossibilities. There is not one crowned head in this wide world who would not find here scores of his former subjects who have since become good and loyal American citizens. Our great American family consists of people of all races, climes, and tongues. We have the Indian, the negro, the Chinaman, the Mexican, the Arab, Nubian, and Persian, the Japanese, the Filipino, the Cuban and Porto Rican. Orient and Occident, the sunny South and the icy North are alike represented, and all, Germans and French, English and Irish, Russian and Hungarian, have forgotten their historical differences and are living side by side in peace and friendship as American brethren. What a wholesome object lesson to the rulers of men of the magic influence of political liberty. Yes, the St. Louis World's Fair will not only be a school, a college, a university for us, but also an inspiration to all mankind and their rulers.

Not one dissenting voice has been raised in the press of the country. If there has, we do not know of it. Here are editorial expressions from some of the leading newspapers of the country:

[St. Louis Globe-Democrat.]

The first practical steps toward the suitable observance of the centennial of the purchase, during Jefferson's Administration, of the Louisiana province from France have been taken. Mr. BARTHOLOMEW has introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to authorize the holding of an international exposition at St. Louis in 1903. This will be the hundredth anniversary of the Louisiana acquisition, and the exposition is designed to commemorate that event.

The acquisition of Louisiana was by far the greatest achievement of Jefferson's Administration. It will make his Presidency illustrious throughout all time. The glory which it sheds upon his name is as bright and as lasting as that which is cast upon it by his authorship of the Declaration of Independence. From the beginning of its life as a nation onward until 1803 the United States comprised only the region between the Atlantic and the east bank of the Mississippi, an area of 828,000 square miles.

The Louisiana acquisition added 1,172,000 square miles to its possessions, more than doubling its area, and gave it about two-thirds of its present territory west of the Mississippi, the rest of it being obtained subsequently from Mexico, except in the case of Oregon and Washington, which were gained through discovery, settlement, and treaty with England. Louisiana's acquisition settled at once the burning issue of the navigation of the Mississippi, made the country's extension to the Pacific inevitable, and put the United States in a conspicuous place among the great nations of the earth.

Everybody believes, of course, that St. Louis is the proper place in which to hold the exposition. It is the largest city in the Louisiana territory, and it is nearer the geographical center of the country than any other great town. In its facilities for quick and frequent communication with every other point in the country no other inland city approaches it except Chicago, which is outside of the Louisiana district. The sentimental reasons for holding the exposition in St. Louis are reinforced by important practical considerations. On both grounds the claims of St. Louis for the honor of being the Louisiana exposition town are so numerous and so obvious that they will not be seriously challenged anywhere.

[New York World.]

It would be difficult to do more than justice to the epoch-making event which it is proposed to celebrate. It is second in national importance only to the establishment of our independence. It made possible the complete rounding out of the national domain. It clearly indicated the course of every subsequent territorial and political development, not merely in our country, but in our continent. It marked the end of Spanish rule in Central and South America. It made inevitable the acquisition alike of Florida and Texas and the Pacific coast. If the exposition proposes to represent the growth and development of all the States which came to us through the Louisiana purchase, it will have to include a very ample territory, which has been ours less than a century.

By the terms of the measure before Congress, the national appropriation is to be limited to \$5,000,000. It is to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and to be available only after the sum of \$10,000,000 has been raised and expended on the exposition by the people of Missouri and of St. Louis.

An appropriation so well guarded should meet with no opposition in either House of Congress, and a movement which has the enthusiastic support of so vast a population in so vast an area—every State in the Louisiana purchase territory favors it—has a just title to recognition as a national project.

[The Washington Post.]

It seems to us that St. Louis is entitled to prompt and respectful consideration in this matter of the proposed celebration of the Louisiana purchase. A dozen reasons, each one of them imperative and unanswerable, might be put forward in support of this hypothesis. In the first place, St. Louis is the practical center and the actual metropolis of the vast territory added to the United States through the negotiations initiated by Thomas Jefferson. Again, the event to be celebrated is, next to the success of the revolution of 1776, the most important in our national history. Finally, the people of St. Louis have made a proposition so fair, so liberal, and so businesslike that it commends itself to approval at the first glance.

We recall, in the history of national anniversaries, celebrations, centennials, etc., which have been aided by the Government, none of greater significance and merit, none in which good faith has been more securely guaranteed and the public Treasury surrounded by better safeguards. Certainly Congress can afford to answer promptly.

[Philadelphia Ledger.]

The Louisiana purchase brought under the Stars and Stripes a vast empire, including the then unknown and unexplored region west of the Mississippi River. The statesmen who were responsible for the acquisition builded better than they knew, since to this day it is not definitely known exactly how much of the present limits of the United States was included in the great unknown land ceded in 1803 to the United States by Napoleon. The purchase included parts of Alabama and Mississippi, the whole of the present States of Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, and the Dakotas, Minnesota, west of the Mississippi; nearly all of Kansas, the whole of the Indian Territory, and the parts of Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana lying east of the Rockies; and some authorities hold that the French rights, to which we succeeded, gave us under the purchase the domain extending to the Pacific and including Idaho, Oregon, and the State of Washington.

Our title to Oregon has been deduced from other sources, however, and the question as to its inclusion within the territory of the Louisiana purchase is disputed. This great empire, constituting half the United States

and now peopled by millions, where only a century ago the Indian and the buffalo roamed at will, was bought for the sum of \$15,000,000.

Senator CULBURNSON, of Texas, claims the right of his State to participate in the celebration as a part of the purchase. The United States received the French rights in 1803, and Texas was French territory; though in our treaty of 1819 with Spain we ceded the territory which now includes Texas. The St. Louis celebration will be a great national event, marking one of the grandest feats of statesmanship, and deserves the support of business bodies of cities generally and of the National Government.

[Baltimore Sun.]

St. Louis proposes to celebrate the centennial of the Louisiana purchase in a manner befitting the event to be commemorated and on a scale commensurate with the acquisition by the United States of such an enormous area of territory. The Louisiana purchase was expansion along the only safe lines. The territory acquired from France in 1803, during the Administration of Mr. Jefferson, included all the country west of the Mississippi not occupied by Spain as far north as the British possessions. It comprises the whole or a part of Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Oregon, Indian Territory, Colorado, the Dakotas, Idaho, Montana, Washington, and Wyoming. The Mississippi Valley is to-day the center of the food supply for the United States and the nations of the world. The States included in the Louisiana purchase furnished last year 300,000,000 bushels of the total wheat production of this country, or nearly 55 per cent of it. During the war with Spain all the horses, mules, and beef used by the United States Army came from the Louisiana purchase States. These States are now supplying the people of Great Britain with a large part of their food supplies.

The progress made by the territory which constitutes the Louisiana purchase States has been phenomenal, and St. Louis thinks it should be signalized by a world's fair. The people of St. Louis have raised \$5,000,000 by voluntary subscription for this great undertaking, and the city of St. Louis has contributed an additional \$5,000,000. A bill is now pending in Congress providing for aid by the National Government to the amount of \$5,000,000. Congress was liberal in its treatment of Chicago, and St. Louis asks only a similar measure of generosity. With such means available for a world's fair at St. Louis, it would excel any international exposition ever before attempted. The surplus products of the Louisiana purchase States now find their way into the markets of the world, and if a world's fair, as it probably would, should increase the demand for these products in Europe, South America, and the Far East, the whole country would be benefited. If Congress can see its way clear to appropriate \$5,000,000 out of its immense surplus for the proposed exposition at St. Louis, the world's fair to commemorate the Louisiana purchase would doubtless be a brilliant success, in which the nations of the world would gladly cooperate.

[The Washington Mirror.]

There is a bill before Congress which asks for \$5,000,000 for the centennial of the Louisiana purchase in 1903. It should pass. The great nation can not afford to be niggardly in a matter such as this. The celebration of the centennial of the Louisiana purchase is not a local matter; it is a national affair. The city of St. Louis, where the proposed exposition is to be held, has already pledged itself to a guarantee fund of \$10,000,000. This colossal amount shows the sentiment of the people of the great Southwest. As a matter of fact, the nation ought to be proud that it possesses a city so public spirited, so generous. The claims of St. Louis upon Congress must be recognized. The people demand it. To properly exhibit to the world the magnificent resources of the Southwestern States such an exposition is necessary, is timely, is proper. And this apart from the celebration of the Louisiana purchase. Let there be no cheese-paring policy in regard to the St. Louis Exposition. The money asked could not be put to a better purpose, a purpose which will serve to aggrandize us, increase our commerce, and do more to develop that section of the country than anything else possibly could do.

[Chicago Times-Herald.]

The year 1903 will be the centennial anniversary of the birth of the Jeffersonian idea of territorial expansion. In 1803 President Jefferson looked over the Federal Constitution, and finding it no bar to the acquisition of new territory asked Congress to let him have \$15,000,000 with which to purchase from France the Louisiana tract, embracing 1,235,450 square miles.

The city of St. Louis, being the most important city in the Louisiana tract, is planning to celebrate the centennial anniversary of this purchase with a "world's fair," to be held in that city in 1903. It is fitting that St. Louis should have the fair, and she should have direction over it, but such an exposition, celebrating a historical event second only in importance to the signing of the Declaration of Independence, is essentially a national enterprise. In recognition of this fact St. Louis has asked Congress for an appropriation of \$5,000,000 to aid the project, this amount to be available on condition that the sum of \$10,000,000 be raised locally.

The sum asked for is a small one considering the exceptional importance of such a fair to the entire nation. It will not only celebrate the first great "expansion" act at a most opportune time, but will furnish an exhibit of the products and resources of this "great empire of the West" that will impress the people of the Old World and the New with the wealth, power, and grandeur of the nation.

[Cleveland Leader.]

The promoters of the exposition which St. Louis intends to hold in 1903, to celebrate the centennial of the Louisiana purchase, command respect everywhere when they ask aid in influencing Congress to appropriate \$5,000,000 for the purpose of the enterprise. It is not that the sum sought is so great. Mere impudence might account for that. The point is that St. Louis asks a big national appropriation only on the condition that not less than \$10,000,000 shall be raised locally for exposition purposes. Congress is requested to contribute not over half as much money as St. Louis and the State of Missouri shall be willing to invest.

On such terms it is hard to refuse aid. Progressive and enlightened people the country over recognize that a great industrial and commercial exposition helps all sections and all classes. It is a vast school as well as a place of recreation and pleasure. It promotes civilization and the development of national wealth and resources. It is a source of increased business power and activity. For these reasons it is always proper to give respectful consideration to requests for national participation, on a large scale, in a big exposition, wherever it may be held.

[Pittsburg (Pa.) Chronicle-Telegraph.]

Really, Congress might go a step further and dedicate half a million toward causing distinguished foreigners, scientists, artists, literary men, merchants, engineers, etc., to visit the fair, and incidentally travel through the country, becoming acquainted with its resources, people, institutions, scenery, etc. A liberally planned hospitality would make its returns in many ways. At any rate, the \$5,000,000 asked for should be granted at an early time, so that the St. Louis people may, with spirit, go to work and raise the remainder.

[Boston Herald.]

We have recently called attention to the application made to Congress for an appropriation to aid in the world's fair to be held in St. Louis in 1903.

This is clearly a national enterprise, and as such it seems to us is worthy the national assistance asked for it. The event it proposes to commemorate was the most important one that followed the establishment of the National Government. It gave to the United States the territory between two oceans, in place of confining it to the region of the Atlantic seaboard, and also brought the great rivers, Mississippi and Missouri within its dominions, furnishing what is indispensably needed, an outlet from its West to the Gulf of Mexico. St. Louis is acting in a very liberal spirit in this affair, and she asks aid of Congress only after a pledge to do her full part in the commemoration.

[Minneapolis Tribune.]

Congress made a liberal appropriation in aid of the Chicago World's Fair, and it should now be equally liberal with St. Louis, or perhaps more liberal, inasmuch as our country has expanded since 1893 and there is an opportunity for a bigger exposition. It is reasonable to suppose that the attendance of foreign visitors at St. Louis will be larger than it was at Chicago, since events of the last two years have brought the United States into closer contact than ever before with the countries of the Old World. An international exhibition in the largest city of the former Louisiana Territory, with exhibits and visitors from the leading centers of both hemispheres, will be opportune in the extreme. It will also tend to the establishment and cementing of new ties, the strengthening of existing commercial relations, and the creation of new ones of great and lasting value.

[St. Paul Dispatch.]

"On the event of this mission depend the future destinies of this Republic." So declared Thomas Jefferson when Monroe started for France to effect the purchase of Louisiana. It is to celebrate that purchase that St. Louis has in view an exposition to be held in 1903, and to be opened on the date of May 2, when the negotiations between the astute Talleyrand and the fortunately equally astute Livingstone and Monroe were finally concluded. It is fitting that St. Louis should have this honor. She is the most important city standing to-day on the purchase ground, a statement St. Paul can safely make, as she rests upon territory which has always from the beginning been a part of the original domain of the United States. New Orleans, which might compete, is on the east side of the river, and, moreover, is not so typical an American city as St. Louis, notwithstanding the latter's French name. St. Louis was determined upon as the site of the exposition by a convention of delegates from the States and Territories which have been carved out of the "purchase."

[Jersey City (N. J.) Evening Journal.]

With all the millions of money which Americans will spend in visiting the Paris Exposition, comparatively few thousands of Americans will see the show. Coming right on top of it next year will be the Pan-American Fair at Buffalo. Before either of these fairs has been held, however, a measure has been laid before Congress calling for an appropriation of \$5,000,000 in aid of a world's fair to be held in St. Louis in 1903 to celebrate the centennial of the Louisiana purchase.

The events of the last two years have brought the United States into closer contact than ever before with the countries of the Old World. An international exposition in the largest city in the Louisiana territory, with exhibits and visitors from the leading centers of both hemispheres, will not only be opportune in the extreme, but will also tend to the establishment and building up of new ties, the strengthening of existing commercial relations and the creation of new ones of great and lasting value.

[Austin (Tex.) Daily Statesman.]

Texas should improve the opportunity which this international fair will present. It is worthy of the sympathy and the support of her people. It will furnish the occasion for a world-wide advertisement of the matchless natural gifts and advantages of which we so proudly boast. Wisely utilized, it will mark an epoch in our history and become a century landmark in the pathway of our industrial and commercial progress. Indeed, the harvest of benefits we may reap will be as manifold as it will be enduring.

It behooves us to avoid the folly which made the Lone Star painfully conspicuous at Chicago in 1893 by its absence. If we are true to our best interests, we will not only patronize the St. Louis fair, but we will signalize our presence in that prosperous and progressive city by a display of our industrial wares that will defy competition. No State has such wealth and variety of resources as Texas. In the diversified products of field and plain, forest and mine, she stands without a peer. These rich treasures of soil and climate should be gathered together and fashioned into an exhibit worthy the prestige, the patriotism, and the greatness of the most imperially endowed Commonwealth in the great sisterhood of States.

[Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times.]

The city of St. Louis is getting on well with the projected exposition to be held in 1903 to celebrate the centennial of the Louisiana purchase. The enterprise is sure to be a great success, the greatest thing of its kind in the first decade of the new century. Every State in the purchase should contribute in cash, and each make an exhibit that would dwarf all their efforts in the past in that line. St. Louis does her duty courageously when she lends off with a fund of \$5,000,000. If all the rest of the imperial domain that is interested shall do anything like as well, the fair will be the finest and grandest the world ever saw.

[New York Commercial.]

St. Louis is to be congratulated on the enterprise its leading citizens have shown in making preparations for a grand international exposition, to be held in celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the Louisiana purchase. Not since the Columbian Exposition of 1892 has a fair of this kind been projected on a scale so magnificent. The commercial benefit of such an exhibition in the Mississippi Valley is so obvious that it needs no comment. One hundred years ago the territory acquired from France was a howling wilderness. New Orleans and environments, with a few trading towns up the river, were all there was of apparent value to show for the money Mr. Jefferson paid. Now there is a population of at least 20,000,000 sturdy American citizens there, home owners, patriots, energetic, industrious, and prosperous.

[Washington Star.]

Two years from now the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory by Mr. Jefferson will be celebrated by the holding of an exposition in the city of St. Louis. The enterprise is cast in an ambitious mold, and is certain to be worthy of the occasion. The means to insure success will be ample, and those by whom the outlays will be made are residents of one of the most attractive and progressive of American cities. St. Louis will contribute \$10,000,000, the National Government \$5,000,000, and the State of Missouri \$1,000,000. Here, then, will be \$16,000,000 in the hands of men of brilliant accomplishments and large views for the celebration of an event in which the whole country takes the greatest possible pride. Can success be doubted? Are we not reasonably certain to witness such an achievement as will illustrate not only the inestimable value of the Louisiana territory as a part of the American Union, but at the same time the great power and importance of the Union itself?

But note particularly the amount to be expended—sixteen millions of dollars! That happens to be \$1,000,000 more than Mr. Jefferson paid for the whole of the territory. So that we shall have at the end of one hundred years a well-arranged spectacle commemorating the purchase of the territory which will cost more than the territory itself did, and presented in the leading city of the section then acquired, and which contains a larger population and more wealth than any city in the United States did at the time Mr. Jefferson occupied the White House.

How this information would "paralyze" those pessimistic patriots of 1893 who could see nothing but disaster to the Union in Mr. Jefferson's purchase! How stoutly they would insist upon an affidavit before they would accept it! Imagine the effect on a Senator White—remembered now only in connection with the opposition to Mr. Jefferson—who said on the subject of the territory:

"I believe it will be the greatest curse that could at present befall us. The settlement of this country will be highly injurious and dangerous to the United States. We have already territory enough, and when I contemplate the evils that may arise to these States from this intended incorporation of Louisiana into the Union I would rather see it given to France, to Spain, or to any other nation of the earth, upon the mere condition that no citizen of the United States should ever settle within its limits, than to see the territory sold for a hundred millions of dollars and we retain the sovereignty."

As history has a way of repeating itself, even in big real estate transactions, is there anything violent in the suggestion that the twenty-fifth or the fiftieth anniversary of American sovereignty in the Philippines may be celebrated by an exposition at Manila, the cost of which may exceed the purchase price of the whole archipelago? There are great possibilities for development in that quarter of the globe, and this is an age of push and progress.

Hazing at West Point.

SPEECH

OF

HON. B. T. CLAYTON,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 27, 1901.

On the conference report on the bill (H. R. 12346) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York said:

Mr. SPEAKER: In making our report the special committee of investigation was limited by the object for which it was appointed. We did not desire to be unfair to the institution, but we were appointed to investigate the practice of severe hazing that has grown up at West Point in recent years, and the report was confined to that subject. The unanimous report of the committee condemns the practice of hazing. The legislation proposed will, I believe, stop it. In our condemnation of this unlawful practice, do not let it be supposed that your committee have lost sight of the general excellence of the institution and its necessity, or the good results that it has accomplished and is accomplishing to-day.

No one on the committee or in the House is more anxious than I am to correct this evil and to bring the Academy up to date and make it what the people of the United States want it to be. I join, therefore, with my colleagues on the committee in strongly urging the passage, at an early date, of the bill proposed by the investigating committee, which, I think, will be of very great benefit to the institution. Yet I think it but fair at this time to call attention to the fact that this committee has gathered together in their evidence all the fighting and hazing that has gone on at the institution for three years and put it into one account.

Take any other body of 400 vigorous, healthy young men, summarize all their misdeeds for the same time, and you will have quite an account. In fairness to the Academy I think it should be noted also that the worst of these acts of hazing were committed by young men who are not now in the service, but have been weeded out. It is the desire of the authorities at the Academy and is the result of the course there, that the worst hazers do not graduate. While condemning the previous law, or rather the want of a proper law, which made it possible for these boys to carry on their system of hazing and prearranged class fighting, I think it but fair to say that often young men of very excellent character will be found ready and willing to enter upon these things, without vicious intent, unless there is a positive law against it. It should be noted also that the charges against the Academy usually come from disappointed friends of young men who have failed as cadets.

The illustrious Sheridan while a cadet was expelled, which sentence was afterwards remitted to one year's suspension, on account of fighting. Custer, I believe, had his diploma refused him upon the graduation of his class because of some trouble that he was in on account of a fight. Many of our best officers in the Army had their experience in boyish fights and hazing while at the Academy. It often happens that the same qualities of character which in mature manhood make the gallant officer of intrepidity, of tenacity of purpose, and of uncompromising loyalty to duty, in a boy render a certain amount of disciplinary punishment necessary.

A boy of positive, pugnacious character, if he have honorable instincts, may make a good officer, but all the science and education known in our day can not make a soldier of the milk-and-water youth who does not possess that necessary quality termed by Col. Theodore Roosevelt as the "fighting edge." If the time ever comes when 400 representative American youths, selected from all parts of the country, can be brought together in close association and voluntarily perform all their duties and behave to each other in such a lamblike way as to need no correction or punishment, then it will be time for the United States to stop training young men for soldiers and to make a contract with some other more vigorous nation to protect us in our difficulties with foreign powers.

Where men are educated for positions of trust and power over other men, as at our Academy, it is of great importance that we guard them against everything that would have a tendency to instill brutality, and I am in favor of a comprehensive and specific law to break up this senseless custom. At the same time let us not lose sight of the fact that in every war that is waged, where there is one man unjustly punished there are ten men allowed to suffer through incompetency and lack of character on the part of those in whose power it is to look out for the soldiers. It is not the severe officer that we have to fear in time of war, but it is the indifferent officer.

It is not discipline that kills men; it is the want of it. The enforcement of sanitary regulations and rigid compliance with all the rules required for health in camp and field service can only be obtained by the administration of a vigorous, determined officer. The leading of men on the field of battle, the final test of an officer, requires a positive determination and bravery. There is no place in the military calling for the simply negative character, however free he may be from faults.

In 1898 the colonel of one of our volunteer regiments in the Philippine Islands had been severely condemned for his vigorous enforcement of discipline. I believe that the legislature of the State from which his regiment came went so far as to pass resolutions condemning him; yet afterwards, when active service began the members of the regiment began to appreciate the good results accomplished by the course of this officer to such an extent that these resolutions were rescinded. When the regiment was in an untenable position on the field of battle that colonel extricated it by leading in person a charge upon the enemy's position, winning the fight and saving many of his men from death and wounds, though losing his own life in the charge. Not until then was he fully appreciated.

As the Military Academy has been the subject of many harsh expressions of late, I beg the indulgence of the House while I recall a few facts concerning its origin and development. The Father of his Country, in his last annual message to Congress, says:

The institution of a military academy is also recommended by cogent reasons. However pacific the general policy of a nation may be, it ought never to be without an adequate stock of military knowledge for emergencies. The first would impair the energy of its character, and both would hazard its safety or expose it to greater evils when war could not be avoided. Besides that, war might not often depend upon its own choice. In proportion as the observance of pacific maxims might exempt a nation from the necessity of practicing the valor of the military art, ought to be its care in preserving and transmitting, by proper establishment, the knowledge of the art.

Whatever arguments may be drawn from particular examples superficially viewed, a thorough examination of the subject will evince that the art of war is at once comprehensive and complicated, that it demands much previous study, and that the possession of it in its most improved and perfect state is always of great moment to the security of a nation. This, therefore, ought to be a serious care of every government, and for this purpose an academy, where a regular course of instruction is given, is an obvious expedient which different nations have successfully employed.

This subject was brought to Washington's attention by his experience in the Revolutionary war, when he had been compelled to secure the services of many foreigners versed in the science of war, and also by his observance of our Army after the war had ceased, when it was difficult to keep up the high standard which he had developed through active service and which he deemed so essential to the permanent safety of the country. Subsequent events proved the wisdom of Washington.

At the commencement of the war of 1812 our Army was not up to the standard that had been advocated first by Washington and afterwards by Jefferson, and our Military Academy, though it had been established in 1802, had not received the attention which it ought to have had, and there were but 65 of its graduates in the service. But few of our regulars had ever seen the field of battle; they were not well versed in military affairs, and but few of our officers were educated as they ought to have been. Hence, the years 1812 and 1813, excepting sea fights, recorded more defeats in proportion to the number of victories than has ever been recorded in any war that America has ever waged.

In the next two years American bravery, stimulated by bitter experience and previous defeat, redeemed itself and brought to a successful close this second war with Great Britain. Though few in number, the graduates of the Military Academy sustained an

important part in the last campaigns of this war; one-sixth of them were killed in battle, one-quarter were killed and wounded, and one-fifth of those who served received one or more brevets for their distinguished gallantry in this war. At the close of this war the Military Academy was fully developed and put upon the basis which it now has.

In the beginning of the Mexican war there were over 500 highly educated graduates in the service and nearly as many more in civil life ready to offer their services should their country need them. I quote here from a distinguished writer on this subject:

Our Regular Army, mostly officered by them, had acquired experience in fighting savages on our extended frontier, and had learned discipline in the swamps of Florida. Our brave volunteers, with high aptitude to form the best of soldiers, wisely sought the élèves of our national school and tendered to them the command of their regiments and battalions. The material of battle had been prepared by skilled hands, and educated minds directed the complicated machinery of war. The consequence of this fortuitous condition of things, despite political machinations, is too well known to be required to be detailed here. Suffice it to say that, in comparing this with the preceding war, the fruits of military education are most apparent.

In Canada during two and a half years, with much larger forces than the enemy, our defeats outnumbered our victories, our gains in prisoners of war were less than our losses, our trophies were few, and our conquests scarce extended beyond the camps we occupied. In the Mexican war our small but heroic Army in less than a year and a half, though opposed to the quadruple force of the enemy, won 30 victories, captured 40,000 soldiers, took a thousand cannon and an immense amount of small arms and munitions of war, carried 10 fortified places and the capital of the enemy, and extended our conquests over the immense territory of Mexico and California. The gain of that war, to say nothing of national reputation, now annually pays more than thrice the total cost of the conquest.

Soon after the Mexican war General Scott said:

I give it as my fixed opinion that but for our graduated cadets the war between the United States and Mexico might, and probably would, have lasted some four or five years, with, in its first half, more defeats than victories falling to our share; whereas, in less than two campaigns we conquered a great country and a peace without the loss of a single battle or skirmish.

In this war it is said that one-fifth of the graduates were killed and more than one-third were wounded.

It is not necessary for me to mention the names of those who rose to prominence or those who died in battle in our great civil war. That war furnishes a greater number of examples than any other war known in the history of the world wherein the commanders were selected from all walks of life. Its close, however, found that, in general, there remained in the highest places only those who had been systematically educated in military matters. There were Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, Hancock, and a host of others on the side of the North, with a smaller but brilliant array on the side of the South.

There could be no more practical illustration that military genius, however requisite to a great commander, must be aided by professional schooling and training. The object of war is peace upon such conditions as are demanded by your country. A great commander must obtain the maximum effect in the minimum time with the greatest saving possible of lives and money for his side. Where time is so limited and action imperative, it would not be fair to put any man at the head of so complicated an organization as an army in modern times without the most thorough education in the method of handling it and absolute familiarity with all the means it is to use in the accomplishment of its purposes.

The plans even of a genius, unless he have skill and experience as a commander, are apt to go wrong. It must ever be remembered that in modern times, in order to be successfully waged by any nation, must be carried on with all the science and all the means which our day and civilization have developed. It must be waged according to the rules and principles which it is necessary that all officers should know before they are fit to command. The members of this House realize that it is wiser to learn lessons taught by our own history than it is to again have to purchase experience by any unnecessary shedding of blood on the battle-fields.

It is true that the complete education of the soldier can not be obtained alone in military academies, but requires also the greater schools of the march, the camp, and the battlefield, and that the great general can only be developed by the actual experience of campaigns added to the lessons taught by the masters of the art of war. It is also true that great commanders can not be made unless they be born with genius to conceive and the energy, ingenuity, and daring to execute great plans. But besides these natural gifts he must have the knowledge of the means with which he is to work and the knowledge of the methods of other great generals before he is able to successfully meet an able and educated enemy.

Some commanders have risen to great prominence and renown by their genius alone, without great learning, but the great masters, such as Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon, Washington, Lee, and Grant, have been great students, and were not only great in the practice, but were also learned in the art of war. Napoleon, who exceeded all others in the dazzling brilliancy and the great number of his victories, had received the best military education attainable in his time, and from his very boyhood up had been a

student of the military features of the map of Europe and of the very problems that he afterwards was called upon to solve.

Washington was a man of great education and learning, and in his young manhood had great experience in Indian and French fighting, and for many years previous to his command of the American Army had been a student of the history and art of war. And what is true of these two is equally true of the others. And to-day, with the advances that have been made in the weapons and other materials used in warfare, the technical education of officers is more important than ever. Our recent experiences show us that we can not always avert war, but we can prepare to meet it in the most economical and effective way.

The most striking example of the advantages of education and preparation are found in the Franco-German war. There large armaments were formed, large numbers of soldiers were put into the field in a short time, battles of tremendous size and importance were fought, and campaigns waged with rapidity. Greater results were obtained in proportion to the loss than had perhaps ever been witnessed in the history of the world up to that time.

In 1898 this country surprised the rest of the world by the rapidity with which it obtained peace with Spain upon its own conditions. This success was due no less to the education and efficiency of our small Regular Army at the beginning than to the superior vigor and bravery of our men as compared with those of the enemy. You can not have too much discipline, general education, and special training in the Army. Soldiers when not fighting should be kept busy drilling and studying. Service in the Army for officers and enlisted men should be a course of instruction from beginning to end.

It is not for the benefit of the Military Academy or its cadets that Congress yearly makes appropriations for its support, but it is for the benefit of the nation itself that it maintains that great institution of science and military art. By supporting it we practice the most useful and the most intelligent economy in men and money. A generation has never passed since its foundation when it has not many times repaid us the cost of its maintenance since its beginning to the present day by the diffusion of that special knowledge which Washington said was so essential to the very existence of a nation, not to mention the execution of public works and other duties performed with the proverbial integrity of its graduates. The greater the education of all our officers and the more thoroughly our Army is instructed the more valuable it will be as a nucleus in time of emergency and the lesser will be the cost of victory.

In speaking of the absolute necessity of military education and in advocating the usefulness and efficiency of the West Point Academy, I do not for one instant lose sight of the merits of those great men who, without previous training, rise to the leadership of men in all our wars. All honor to the brave and patriotic volunteers of '61 and '98 who, upon the call of the President, came from every walk in life to enter the service of the nation. The promptness and freedom with which they entered the service of the country, their intelligence and endurance, their self-sacrifice and bravery entitle them to all the praise that we can give them.

Never in the history of this country have we been more in the need of intelligent, loyal, upright Army officers than we are to-day. However our countrymen may differ in theory we have a new problem to solve as to how we are to handle the Philippine Islands. As soon as possible the civil authorities should be put in the ascendancy, but surely no practical man will deny the necessity for, and the great part to be played by, a large armed force in that country for some years to come.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to add to the report of the committee concerning hazing; but I do say this, that in judging the conduct of our young men at West Point we should not use the same standard of comparison that would be proper if we were attempting to regulate the affairs of a theological seminary. In such an institution the cultivation of correctness of life and the inculcation of gentleness of spirit and Christian forbearance and resignation are the first requisites. The young divine must learn to love above all other things the heroism of martyrs. But for soldiers we must have positive, aggressive characters, who do not resign to martyrdom, but under all circumstances seek to use energy and life itself to attain immediate and material victory.

If I were attempting to criticize the Academy, I should not find fault so much with what is done there that ought not to be done as I would to call attention to the fact that it is very difficult and almost impossible for the authorities to find out a man's positive adaptability for the service. The rules and regulations, while positive in laying out the work to be accomplished, are all negative so far as concerns the development of character. They are full of provisions about what should not be done. A boy of industrious habits and capacity sufficient to master the studies, yet with no fight in him, might, so far as the authorities are concerned, and without the standard set by the boys themselves, pass through the course with flying colors.

The recognition of this fact in a vague way, not understood

even by themselves, is the underlying principle which made every cadet that came before the committee speak in favor of some way of testing a man's natural fitness for military life. This ambition to have every son of the Academy positively fit for the military profession more than any other thing is the cause of the system of hazing which has always existed at the Academy, and which about three years ago grew to such proportions as to cause the present action of Congress in stopping it. The influence of his fellows should not be underestimated in the education of a cadet.

The rating of the cadets at the Academy according to the estimation in which they are held by their fellow-cadets while there corresponds to a large extent to the order of merit in which they take their places as officers of the Army. The order in which they are rated by the authorities does not seem to be an indication as to their future rating in the Army. You will find that many of those who afterwards achieved distinction stood high, as did McClellan, Sherman, and Lee, while just as many stood low, as did Grant, Sheridan, and Custer; but you will find that in almost every instance such men all had the esteem of their fellow-cadets while at the Academy.

When the First Division of the First Army Corps took the little town of Coama, P. R., August 9, 1898, the Spanish colonel commanding, when he thought defeat or retreat was inevitable, came out openly, intentionally exposing himself, and died with 16 bullet wounds in him. Later that year Colonel Stotsenburg, in command of a Nebraska regiment in the Philippines, saw a number of his command in an untenable position in front of the rebel lines and unable to get out of it. Stotsenburg went to his lines, gave the command "Charge!" leading his men in a successful advance, and, with but small loss, captured the rebel works and extricated his men from a deadly position. Stotsenburg was killed, but his death came in the accomplishment of victory and saved his men. Between the courageous sacrifice by Stotsenburg of his own life for the accomplishment of victory and glory, and the pusillanimous loss of courage in the critical moment and the consequent suicide of the Spaniard at Coama, there is no comparison. Give us men like Stotsenburg for our officers and this country will never know defeat.

Let us pass such laws as will require the cadets to live up to the standard required by the great American people. Prescribe punishment for infraction of rules, and put the administration of these laws beyond fear or favor of political influence. But above all, Mr. Speaker, Congress should always avoid putting a premium in our Military Academy upon mere negative qualities. It is always to be remembered that a lazy, incompetent, indifferent, or cowardly man in command of an armed force is by far the worst man you could put there.

The young men whom we were sent to investigate at West Point are, I believe, as fine a body of young men as you could get together in this broad land of ours. Gathered from all conditions of life, from all parts of this great country, they were attracted to this historic institution by soldierly instinct and enthusiasm. They know—and they are glad of the fact—that they will soon go to join our forces in a tropical country, fighting against a savage foe, and that many of them will, in a short time, be placed beneath the sod in these distant islands. They feel that to be worthy of their alma mater they must meet with eagerness and enthusiasm all difficulties and dangers that may await them.

War Revenue.

SPEECH

OF

HON. VINCENT BOREING,

OF KENTUCKY,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 28, 1901.

On the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12394) "to amend an act entitled 'an act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes,' approved June 13, 1898, and to reduce taxation thereunder."

Mr. BOREING said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The internal-revenue system in the United States is a result of the civil war of 1861. A war tax was then levied upon the business transactions and industries of the country, together with an income tax, in order to raise money to carry on that war, at the close of which the country was involved in a debt of more than \$2,000,000,000. And in order to liquidate this indebtedness and to pay the extraordinary expenses that followed the war, as such unusual expenses always follow a war, the least annoying and most unobjectionable provisions of the war tax were continued, especially the tax on whisky and tobacco. It was then

the policy of the Government to place this burden upon such industries and products as the people could do without and leave the necessities of life free from taxation for these purposes.

When President Harrison turned over the reins of Government to his successor, Mr. Cleveland, in 1892, this indebtedness had been reduced to \$585,000,000, but in time of profound peace, when the Democratic party had full sway in every department of the Government, from 1892 to 1896, the public debt was increased by nearly \$300,000,000. When the country became involved in war with Spain in 1898, with this indebtedness against us, in order to provide revenues to carry on the war against Spain the Congress of the United States enacted the present law providing for the taxes that are now being collected. This war having been fought to a successful conclusion, we are now asked by our constituency to relieve them of this war tax. But we are again confronted by the fact that we have more than a half billion of the war debt of 1861 increased by about \$300,000,000 indebtedness that was inherited from the Cleveland Administration, coupled with the extraordinary expenses resulting from the Spanish-American war.

Our constituents, of course, are not all agreed as to what articles or items of taxation should be relieved. But, as is usual in such cases, each class is awake to its own interest. I have been glad to note in the correspondence of my constituents that the people of the eleventh district of the State of Kentucky base their request not upon the claim that the war tax is oppressive upon the people at this time, but upon the grounds that all forms of the stamp tax is more or less annoying to them in the transaction of business. Special complaint is made about the tax on patent medicines, bank checks, telegrams, deeds, mortgages, and notes. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the genuine and permanent prosperity that came to the country with the return of the Republican party to power in the United States has so stimulated all our industries, encouraged business, extended trade and commerce, and thereby furnished new markets for the products of our farms and factories, that it has given employment to all our people with increased remuneration and made the payment of taxes easy. I therefore assume that the present war tax is not oppressing any class of our citizens.

I am opposed to any further reduction in collection of revenues, excepting in so far as to relieve the people from the annoyance of the stamp tax, and, in fact, Mr. Speaker, if I were to follow my individual judgment rather than to be guided, as I am, by the wishes of my constituents, I would make no change in the present law at all until we have met the unusual expenses following the war, and curtailed the indebtedness of the Government at least down to where it was at the close of Mr. Harrison's Administration. When times are prosperous and money and capital employed to the profit of both, I believe that both the people and the Government should pay their debts. It is true that the splendid indorsement given the Republican Administration by the reelection of President McKinley in 1900 has strengthened our credit and confirmed the confidence of the business world in our institutions, but we should not overlook the fact that along with our unmeasured advancement, increased wealth, and enlarged possessions, involving new duties and the solution of great problems, comes proportionately increased responsibilities, and should the United States unfortunately become involved in foreign complications that would result in war a large public debt might prove an embarrassment to us. I am therefore of the opinion that the wisdom and propriety of liquidating our public indebtedness at a time when the payment of taxes oppresses no community or interest will be approved by the people generally.

I congratulate the House conferees on their success with the Senate members of the conference committee in securing the liberal concessions that have been made on the stamp tax in their report now under consideration. Since we have decided to reduce the war revenues by removing a portion of the taxes, I believe the present bill is the best attainable, and shall therefore give it my support. But in doing so I desire to state and emphasize the fact that the exceedingly liberal reduction upon beer does not meet with my approval. I voted against that reduction in the Committee of the Whole when it was made in the House, notwithstanding I had received letters from the breweries all over the country complaining of the excessive burden placed upon their business by existing law. I am now opposed to the reduction provided for in this bill, because it is contrary to the policy of the Government as expressed in the Republican Administration for forty years, and is not demanded by the people that I represent and does not commend itself to my judgment.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a sober constituency. There is but one brewery within the limits of my district, and neither that brewery nor any citizen of my district has made any protest, either to or through its Representative in Congress, against the provision of the present law, and while I have no war to make upon the institution, I am free to say that the majority of the good citizens of the 19 counties that I represent would be willing to see the brewery and whisky interest taxed to death. I am well aware that some

temperance people oppose the taxation of alcoholic industries in any form or degree, because, as they think, it recognizes the validity of these institutions, and not because they think they ought to be allowed to exist. But as they do exist and wield their influence for evil, I believe it is both wise and proper to compel them to bear a liberal share of the burdens of taxation to support the Government.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the brewery interest is well able to take care of itself. Unfortunately, as I believe, oppressive taxation has not been able to destroy them or even to reduce their number or influence, although the contrary has been advocated upon this floor by their numerous and strong advocates. The Congress of the United States, in my judgment, will do well to note the constantly growing sentiment of the people of the United States against the alcoholic traffic in all forms. The whisky traffic is the growing evil of the times. I am not here to advocate the course of Mrs. Nation in Kansas, or the forcible destruction of saloons in any State. The people of the United States did not indorse the action of John Brown in his efforts to liberate the African slave in this country contrary to law, yet his unwise and ill-guided action indicated that slavery was doomed and must go.

Drunkenness is to-day sapping the foundation of the American Republic by its destructive force against the young manhood of the nation. The appeal for the relief of the breweries, therefore, does not commend itself to the public conscience. I repeat that the great majority of the 50,000 voters in the district I have the honor to represent stand for temperance and vote the Republican ticket. The counties that compose the district give more than a thousand majority to the county. The temperance sentiment throughout the South is wider than the political parties and broader than the religious creeds, and far more comprehensive than the Prohibition party. If a vote could be taken independent of politics the people of the South, in my opinion, would vote against the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the United States. My vote, therefore, for this bill carries with it no indorsement of the saloon interests of the country. I accept the measure as the best that can be had under the circumstances, feeling assured that the same will be accepted and approved by my constituency.

Post-Office Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN F. FITZGERALD,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 31, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13739) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902—

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to have the substitute bill which I submitted a few moments ago considered by the House at the present time, as we have completed the sections relating to appropriations for post-office clerks. Inasmuch as it is the intention of the chairman of the committee to reserve a point of order upon this proposition, I wish to call the attention of the House to a few facts in connection with this matter. I therefore ask that I may be permitted to speak on this matter at this time. I offer the amendment which I sent to the Clerk's desk a short time ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to offer the amendment now?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I wish to offer the amendment which I sent to the Clerk's desk a few moments ago and asked to have printed in the RECORD. I refer to the classification bill submitted by the Department, which appears in the report of the First Assistant Postmaster-General. It ought to be called the Beavers bill, as I believe Mr. Beavers framed this measure. I might add that this whole matter could be very easily adjusted if Mr. Beavers's recommendations were carried out. He knows more about post-office clerks' salaries than any man in the country. He is acquainted with the conditions surrounding the work of the post-office clerks and he could be depended upon to do justice to all interests. As I said before, he is the best official, in my judgment, who ever occupied the position. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. The amendment is a very long one, and I ask to waive the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the Chair does not think it is within the power of the committee to waive the reading of the amendment. The Chair thinks probably we can arrive at what the

gentleman desires. The gentleman from Massachusetts desires to address the committee on the classification bill. Without objection the gentleman from Massachusetts will be recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. The classification bill which I have offered as an amendment provides for the increase of salaries of all post-office clerks in the first and second class offices of the country. It provides a minimum salary of \$600, and makes provision for increases annually until the salary reaches \$1,600, provided the clerk's services are satisfactory.

I am greatly surprised that more interest is not taken by the members of the House in this proposition. Surely there is not a member of this body who does not admit the justice of the demand of the post-office clerks that a classification bill should pass, yet when the matter is being discussed comparatively few of the members seem to take any interest in the proposition. I presume if an election was approaching, and the votes and influence of the post-office clerks were needed, every member would be on his feet shouting for the classification bill. [Applause.]

I have taken a deep interest in the post-office clerks classification bill since I have been a member of Congress. The only time that I have seen any great desire on the part of the members of the House to do anything for the clerks was two years ago, when, on a proposition to increase the salaries in some of the grades, a tie vote occurred. Since then, though I have made repeated inquiry from different members of the committee, nothing tangible has resulted in the shape of a favorable report. When members of the committee are asked why the classification bill is not reported, almost every one of them replies, "Well, I am in favor of the clerks' bill." Yet nothing has ever been accomplished. Sometimes the chairman of the committee is blamed, and at other times the Speaker, but I do not think it is fair to shoulder the responsibility on either of these two gentlemen.

I believe if either Mr. LOUD or the Speaker of this House felt that the majority of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads were in favor of the classification bill that neither one of them would stand in the way of its being reported. It is an old saying that promises are easily made and broken, and I think that the post-office clerks of the country have been taken in by various members of Congress, who, around election time, promise anything, and forget everything after they are elected. My experience has taught me to believe that the post-office clerks will not get what belongs to them until they have men located right here in Washington, from their own ranks, to look out for their legislative interests.

Every trust and corporation, the Army, the Navy, the Revenue-Cutter Service, in fact every branch of the Government service except the postal service, whenever anything concerning their interests is being considered by Congress, are represented in the committee room and in the lobbies of the Capitol. Why not the post-office employees? Where a more faithful, honest, and efficient body of public servants in this world to-day than the post-office clerks? [Applause.] What more responsible duties rest upon any class of men in the world than those which rest upon the shoulders of the post-office clerks of this Government? They must be honest, vigilant, sober, industrious, and painstaking.

Only the brightest of those who pass a severe civil service examination are appointed, and these men are required in most instances to substitute quite a little while before securing a regular appointment. In some of the large post-offices of the country, Chicago and St. Louis among the number, after receiving regular appointments the clerks are paid \$400 the first year. In Boston the past two years the men who were appointed, after substituting for a year, were put to work at \$500 per year. These are distinct violations of the spirit of the Post-Office regulations, which provide that all clerks shall receive a minimum salary of \$600 per year.

I desire to bring to the attention of the House at this time a sketch of the ordinary clerk's life in the Boston post-office. What is true in Boston is true in every first-class post-office in the country, and if there is any member of this House, after he peruses this sketch, that thinks the post-office clerk has an easy life or decent remuneration I would like to know who he is.

The character of the work of post-office clerks requires a sound body and intelligence above the ordinary. The clerk must be quick of movement, and his eyes and body are continually in action. He is on his feet all day and his hours are irregular. This is particularly the case of the clerks employed in the mailing division, city division, and stations.

Perhaps the hardest work performed and requiring the greatest amount of ability and intelligence is done by the clerks in the mailing division.

The first work required of a mailing division clerk, after passing from a stamper, is to memorize the post-offices in Massachusetts (814) as they are dispatched on the railroads leaving Boston; also the first separation of the remainder of the United States and Canada, making 80 separations in all.

He is then designated as a separator.

Having thoroughly mastered this work, he passes to the grade of distributor, which requires the greatest mental activity and quickness of body, as upon him depends the proper dispatch of mail on his particular case.

Owing to new railroad connections and other changes he must readily forget the previous distribution of post-offices and learn the new. Much is left to his judgment in handling doubtfully addressed mail; and in forwarding this class of mail he saves much time and perhaps much in trade to the careless writer, although the latter may never be aware of this.

A distributor on the New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania case must have in his mind the proper distribution of 7,500 post-offices. Of this number 90 per cent are sent to railroad post-offices and distributing offices in these States.

In the States of Maine and Vermont 75 per cent of the post-offices are sent to railroad post-offices and distributing offices, and so on through the States of the Union and Canada.

To illustrate the work of these clerks we will suppose that among the thousands of letters dropped in the Boston post-office at 5 o'clock p. m. are 11 letters addressed to the following post-offices: First, Wellsville, N. Y.; second, Point Pleasant, N. J.; third, Titusville, Pa.; fourth, Johnson City, Tenn.; fifth, Orange, Tex.; sixth, Santa Barbara, Cal.; seventh, Oxford, Me.; eighth, Cranston, R. I.; ninth, Passumpsic, Vt.; tenth, Goshen, N. H.; eleventh, North Haven, Conn.

After being canceled they are passed to the separator, who places them in the following boxes: First, New York State; second, New Jersey; third, Pennsylvania; fourth, Southern States; fifth, Western States; sixth, Western States; seventh, Maine (Dis.); eighth, Rhode Island; ninth, Vermont; tenth, New Hampshire (Dis.); eleventh, Connecticut.

These letters are collected by the distributor, who disposes of them as follows: First, Wellsville, N. Y., to New York and Dunkirk R. P. O. west of Hornellsville; second, Point Pleasant, N. J., to New York and Point Pleasant R. P. O. No. 2; third, Titusville, Pa., to Buffalo and Pittsburg R. P. O. north of Oil City; fourth, Johnson City, Tenn., to Bristol and Chattanooga R. P. O.; fifth, Orange, Tex., to New Orleans and Houston R. P. O.; sixth, Santa Barbara, Cal., to Ogden and San Francisco R. P. O.; seventh, Oxford, Me., to Portland and Island Pond R. P. O.; Danville Junction to South Paris; eighth, Cranston, R. I., to Providence and Willimantic R. P. O. east of Plainfield; ninth, Passumpsic, Vt., to Newport and Springfield R. P. O. north of Wells River; tenth, Goshen, N. H., to Newport, N. H. (Dis.); eleventh, North Haven, Conn., to Boston, Providence, and New York R. P. O.

There are exceptions in nearly all cases, and these must receive special care. An exception means that mail for certain offices must be sent via a certain route at one part of the day and via another route another part of the day. As an illustration, take two of the above-addressed letters, Santa Barbara, Cal., and North Haven, Conn. Between the hours of 10.45 a. m. and 6.30 p. m. mail addressed for Santa Barbara, Cal., is made up for Ogden and San Francisco railroad post-office, and the rest of the twenty-four hours, from 6.30 p. m. to 10.45 a. m., it is made up for Albany and Los Angeles railroad post-office. After midnight and until 7.30 a. m. North Haven, Conn., is made up for Boston, Springfield, and New York railroad post-office; from 7.30 a. m. to 8 a. m. it is made up for Boston, Springfield and New York railroad post-office, south of Springfield; from 8 a. m. to 11 a. m. it is made up for New Haven (Dis.), Conn., and from 11 a. m. to midnight it is made up for Boston, Providence and New York.

Each clerk in the mailing division handles on an average 15,000 pieces of mail a day, and the proportion of errors is about 1 to 5,000 pieces.

The work of the clerks in the paper room, where newspapers and merchandise are handled, is identical with that of the letter room, where letters and circulars are handled. Both of these rooms are branches of the mailing division.

The work of the clerks in the city division, where mail is handled for city and station delivery, is next in importance to that of the mailing division, if not as important.

By many, the work of these clerks is considered as intricate as any other class in the post-office, because of the constant changes going on. Firms are daily moving from one section of the city to another, and their patrons still address mail to the old address. The clerk must send to the new address and, of course, carries these changes in mind, as he has not the time to refer to postal orders. He must know who are box-holders, though mail is not addressed to box. He must also know that certain firms have two boxes, one for letter and circular mail, the other for newspapers and packages.

Box-holders are continually surrendering boxes and have mail delivered by carriers, and firms having mail delivered by carriers rent boxes, and thereafter mail is delivered by box. And so there is an everlasting change going on, and clerks must keep these in mind or their value to the post-office ceases.

Clerks in the stations of a large office like Boston not only

perform all that is required of clerks in the mailing division and city division, but also to issue money orders and handle registered-mail matter.

There are many other details in connection with the work of the clerks in the foregoing divisions and stations which would take up much space here, but the facts given above are deemed sufficient to give an idea of what is required of post-office clerks in these divisions and stations, which are the important branches of a post-office.

There may be some member of this House who feels that a post-office clerkship is a sinecure, but if any such member will look over the statement I have just made, when it is printed in the RECORD, and weigh the facts contained therein carefully, he must agree that the post-office clerk deserves every consideration that the classification bill affords him. Go into any of our large city post-offices at election time or during the holiday season and you will find these men working like slaves with no let up until every piece of mail is attended to. So much in illustration of this work. Now as to salaries. I will now instance a few cases of the injustices which have resulted to clerks in the Boston post-office from the operation of the present system. I will use the initials of the clerks' names.

J. H. R., city division, entered service September, 1884; entered \$900 grade in 1891; now receiving \$900, after seventeen years.

D. S., city division, entered service October, 1884; entered \$900 grade in 1891; now receiving \$900 after seventeen years.

E. B. C., city division, entered service 1885; entered \$900 grade in 1894; now receiving \$900 after sixteen years.

W. H. T., city division, entered service June 1886; entered \$900 grade in 1895; now receiving \$900 after fifteen years.

W. J. C., city division, entered service April 15, 1886; entered \$900 grade on May 4, 1895; now receiving \$900 after fifteen years.

J. E. M., city division, entered service 1886; entered \$900 grade in 1894; now receiving \$900 after fifteen years.

W. W. M., mailing division, entered service September 16, 1884; entered \$900 grade in 1890; entered \$1,000 grade in 1899; now receives \$1,000 after seventeen years.

E. W. F., mailing division, entered service October, 1881; entered \$900 grade July, 1889; entered \$900 grade July, 1890; entered \$1,000 grade June, 1899; now receives \$1,000 after nineteen years.

W. A. W., foreman in station case, entered service January 25, 1876; entered \$1,000 grade July, 1889; entered \$1,100 grade July, 1895; entered \$1,200 grade July, 1897 (appointed foreman); now receives \$1,200 as foreman, after twenty-five years.

A. B. L., mailing division, entered service 1883; entered \$700 grade July, 1889; entered \$800 grade July, 1890; entered \$900 grade February, 1897; entered \$1,000 grade July, 1899; now receives \$1,000 after eighteen years.

C. J. F., mailing division, entered service October, 1882; entered \$900 grade July, 1890; entered \$1,000 grade July, 1899; now receives \$1,000; eighteen years.

Joseph A. D., mailing division, entered service April 15, 1875; entered \$1,000 grade August 12, 1890; now receives \$1,000; twenty-five years.

Frank T., mailing division, entered service 1875; entered \$1,100 grade in 1890; now receives \$1,100; twenty-six years.

Eugene R., mailing division, entered service 1885; entered \$700 grade in 1890; entered \$800 grade in 1892; entered \$900 grade in 1897; entered \$1,000 grade in 1900; now receives \$1,000; sixteen years.

John J. C., mailing division, entered service May, 1886; entered \$600 grade in 1889; entered \$700 grade in 1890; entered \$800 grade in 1892; entered \$900 grade in 1897; now receives \$900; fifteen years.

W. H. D. S., mailing division, entered service October 1, 1886; entered \$600 grade 1889; entered \$700 grade in 1890; entered \$800 grade in 1892; entered \$900 grade in 1897; now receiving \$900; fourteen years.

J. J. B., mailing division, entered service October, 1886; entered \$600 grade July, 1889; entered \$700 grade July, 1890; entered \$800 grade April, 1892; entered \$900 grade July, 1897; now receiving \$900; fourteen years.

George A. R., mailing division, entered service December, 1886; entered \$600 grade July, 1889; entered \$700 grade July, 1890; entered \$800 grade April, 1892; entered \$900 grade July, 1897; now receiving \$900; fourteen years.

P. J. F., mailing division, entered service April 9, 1889, \$480; entered \$600 grade July, 1889; entered \$700 grade July, 1892; entered \$800 grade July, 1897; now receiving \$900; twelve years.

E. T. G., mailing division, entered service November, 1888, \$480; entered \$600 grade July, 1889; entered \$700 grade April, 1892; entered \$800 grade July, 1897; entered \$900 grade July, 1899; now receiving \$900; twelve years.

W. E. B., mailing division, entered service October, 1888, \$480; entered \$600 grade July, 1889; entered \$700 grade October, 1894; entered \$800 grade July, 1895; entered \$900 grade July, 1899; now receiving \$900; twelve years.

D. E. S., mailing division, entered service July, 1887, \$480; entered \$600 grade July, 1889; entered \$700 grade; entered \$800 grade July, 1895; now receiving \$800; thirteen and one-half years.

L. T. K., mailing division, entered service October, 1887, \$480; entered \$600 grade July, 1889; entered \$700 grade; entered \$800 grade July, 1893; now receiving \$800; thirteen and one-half years.

T. F. H., mailing division, entered service November, 1889, \$600; entered \$700 grade in 1894; entered \$800 grade in 1897; now receiving \$800; eleven years.

J. J. W., mailing division, entered service July, 1890, \$600; entered \$700 grade July, 1894; entered \$800 grade July, 1897; now receiving \$800; ten years.

E. F. E., mailing division, entered service February 21, 1875; entered \$900 grade December 1, 1885; entered \$1,000 grade July 1, 1895; now receiving \$1,000; twenty-six years.

M. A. W., city division, entered service July 25, 1894, \$600; entered \$700 grade September, 1894; entered \$800 grade July, 1899; now receiving \$800; seven years.

W. R. G., weigher, entered service November, 1889, \$600; entered \$800 grade, 1895; now receiving \$900; eleven years.

F. C., mailing division, entered service 1890, \$600; entered \$800 grade in 1897; now receiving \$800; ten and one-half years.

C. C., mailing division, entered service July, 1884, \$480; entered \$800 grade in 1896; now receiving \$800; sixteen and one-half years.

J. J. D., mailing division, entered service 1887, \$480; now receiving \$900; thirteen years.

T. D. F., mailing division, entered service November, 1888, \$480; entered \$600 grade July, 1889; entered \$700 grade October, 1891; entered \$800 grade July, 1897; now receiving \$800; twelve years.

A scrutiny of this list shows that Mr. LOUD is somewhat mistaken in his statement made the other day when he said, "our bill provides annually a sufficient amount of money for the gradual promotion of these men from \$600 to \$700, from \$700 to \$800, and from \$800 to \$900, and so on up to \$1,400 as they shall prove their efficiency in the service."

I think the salary of the clerks in the postal service of the United States to-day averages less than \$800 a year, and when you consider the character of service rendered they are not only the poorest paid of all classes of Government clerks, but are poorer paid than clerks in any ordinary business establishment. [Applause.]

The post-office clerk must be honest, because he is constantly surrounded by temptation in the form of money and valuables of all kinds sent through the mails; he must be tireless, as well as quick in action, ready to move at an instant's notice in order to facilitate the transmission of the mail; he must be unusually accurate, discerning, and of good judgment in order that letters may not go astray and that mail improperly or insufficiently addressed may reach its rightful owner.

A good post-office clerk must possess all these qualities, and yet this great Government of ours, that will spend in the two sessions of this Congress over a billion and one-half dollars, denies even scant justice to this deserving class of men.

How would any member of this House like to start out tomorrow with a wife and family of children to feed, clothe, and educate on a salary of \$800 a year? Yet this is the average salary paid by the United States Government after ten years of service in all the large cities in the country.

In our large cities the cost of living is a great deal higher than it is in our towns and villages, and this fact ought to be taken into consideration, as well as the fact that the cost of living has gone up a great deal all over the country the past three or four years.

The clerks who pass the general examination here in Washington start in at a salary of \$1,000, work seven hours a day, get thirty days' regular leave, and generally take thirty days' sick leave; yet we pride ourselves on being a Government where every man has an equal opportunity.

There might be some excuse for not meeting the demands of the post-office clerks if the revenues of the Government were deficient, but when we witness the spectacle of millions being paid as premiums to redeem bonds that had not matured in order to take the money out of the Treasury and put it into circulation, as was the case repeatedly last year, it shows that the dollar, not the man, is the governing factor in this country to-day. We need not go outside the Post-Office Department itself to find plenty of avenues to obtain all the money necessary to put the post-office clerks of the country on a substantial classification basis. Every student of the postal business admits that the railroads are greatly overpaid for carrying the mails.

Professor Adams, in his report on railway-mail pay, states "that the railways of the country during the last quarter of a century have been benefited by improved methods of manufacture and changes in the price of equipment and supplies quite independently of the economies introduced as the result of increased traffic, and that \$3,000,000 could be reasonably taken each year from the amount paid to the railroads for mail transportation." If this is

the testimony of this expert, who is admitted by the members of the Postal Commission representing both sides of this Chamber to be the best informed man in this country on the question of railway-mail pay, why did not the Post-Office Committee take some action, reduce the money paid to the railroads by this amount and transfer this sum to the appropriation for salaries for post-office clerks? The railroads of the country do not need this money in order to earn good dividends, as a glance at the price of railroad securities now and three years ago will show phenomenal advances in the price of all railroad stocks and bonds. I desire to submit at this time a short table, which shows very interesting data:

Per cent, by classes, of mail matter sent to railroads.

Class.	Weight for 30 days.	Estimated weight for 365 days.	Per cent of total weight.
	<i>Pounds.</i>	<i>Pounds.</i>	
First class	6,965,248	72,637,586	5.30
Second class	36,606,969	381,757,766	28.34
Second class, free	1,920,925	20,032,563	1.49
Third and fourth class	12,006,690	125,838,025	9.34
Foreign	800,549	8,348,582	.62
Government, free	8,291,332	86,466,748	6.42
Equipment	62,526,082	652,063,970	48.40
Total	129,178,305	1,347,145,180	100
Weight of mail matter from which a revenue is derived	56,439,366	588,581,959	43.69
Weight of mail matter from which no revenue is derived	72,738,939	758,563,221	56.31
Total	129,178,305	1,347,145,180	100

This table shows that 56.31 per cent of the total weight of mail matter which is carried on the railroads of the country furnishes no revenue to the Government and that 48.40 of this percentage is charged to equipment.

A further glance at the figures show that 381,657,766 pounds of the mail carried is second-class matter, and when you consider that the Government receives but \$3,527,032 and pays out \$20,749,435 for the transmission of this class of mail matter, not counting the post-office expenses, which must amount to \$10,000,000 more, it is easy to see how a great saving can be made in this branch of the service. Therefore I say it clearly within reason to argue that if the House is disposed to treat the post-office clerks fairly there are plenty of opportunities to make radical changes which will give the clerks what they ask without costing the Government a dollar.

Mr. CLARK. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to ask why would it not be just as well to equalize the salary by cutting down somebody's pay as by eternally equalizing them in putting salaries up?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. If the gentleman from Missouri feels that way about it, why does he not put his idea into force? I believe this to be the greatest and richest Government on earth, and I know we can afford to pay living salaries to our postal employees. The two sessions of this Congress will authorize the expenditure of a billion and one-half dollars, and yet we are told we can not afford to put into effect the post-office clerks' classification bill. The post-office clerk is accorded the poorest treatment of any of the Government employees, and I believe in giving him a chance to live. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK. Did you ever hear of any of them resigning because they did not get enough?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. How many?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I have known many men to resign. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that I do not think any man is getting very far ahead in this great country that will give his services for twenty-six years and not be able to obtain more than \$720, after having passed through that period in faithful service. I think he is a pretty mean boss who, with ample funds, will continue him on such a small salary.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If he had gone out at first and gone to doing something else he might have amounted to something.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Yes, he might; and if he had worked for a private firm as faithfully as he had worked for the Government he would be far better off. I think as a matter of fair play we ought to begin to pay these people decent salaries and give them a proper and necessary increase of their salaries. I have not noticed any member of Congress trying to reduce the salary paid to Congressmen's clerks. I suppose they earn \$1,200, while the post-office clerks loaf and grow fat. I will not take up the time of the House longer. I think it has been proven beyond a doubt that the post-office clerk is poorly and shabbily treated by the Government. The fact that out of more than 700 clerks in the Boston post-office but 147 received an in-

crease last year proves if all places were treated like Boston that a clerk would receive an increase of \$100 every five years, and starting in at five hundred, as they are now doing in Boston, at the end of twenty-five years he would be receiving \$1,000.

In other words, after twenty-five years' service he would receive the same pay as the average clerk in most bureaus of the Government receives starting in.

This is not fair; it is not honest; and I hope that some day the House will do this vast body of honest, reliable, and faithful men equal and exact justice. The average man in the postal service by the very nature of things must dress neatly, travel in decent society, associate with gentlemen, and enjoy some of the pleasures of the world. Live and let live has always impressed me as an excellent motto. Let us act that motto to this vast army of deserving men, who are the right arm of the business and social interests of the country and on whose efficiency, integrity, and skill the great interests of this country so much depend. [Great applause.]

Many of these clerks are my personal friends. I grew up with many of them and am glad to say that the old associations are not forgotten. I meet them on the street, talk with them at the club, and many of them visit my home, where I am always glad to see them. I know their condition and appeal for justice for them.

I realize that nothing can be done in the few remaining days of the present Congress, but I appeal to the members of the House, particularly to the members of the Post-Office Committee, to give earnest and serious attention to the Post-Office clerks' classification bill to the end that when the next Congress meets an intelligent, sincere, and successful effort can be inaugurated for the passage of a proper bill. [Applause.]

The Late Representative John H. Hoffecker.

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. B. SHATTUC,

OF OHIO.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, February 16, 1901.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tribute to the memory of Hon. JOHN H. HOFFECKER, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Delaware.

"Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a distinguished public servant, the House, at the conclusion of these exercises, shall stand adjourned.

"Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

"Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased."

Mr. SHATTUC said:

Mr. SPEAKER: To the large number of his associates in Congress who, like myself, had the valued privilege of knowing the late Representative JOHN H. HOFFECKER intimately well—and, indeed, to every gentleman in this body, of which he was so faithful and prominent a member—the shock of the suddenness of his demise at his home in Delaware last summer will be vividly and sadly recalled by these tributes of respect and love which we today pay his memory.

The location of his apartments in this city while in attendance upon the sessions of Congress made of him a close neighbor of mine, and our cordial relations with each other were added to and made more pleasurable by this fortunate circumstance during the long period in which I enjoyed his society; and I feel a sense of a gratitude that I was thus enabled to enjoy his companionship when our duties in this Chamber did not interfere with our pleasant and, to me, profitable intercourse.

Mr. HOFFECKER possessed that sincere cordiality of manner, that nobleness of character, inborn politeness, considerate kindness and geniality for everyone with whom he came in contact which is epitomized and best described in the phrase, "a gentleman of the old school." While I have seldom met anyone whose appearance has so impressed me with respect and confidence as did his, his personality and character commanded the respect and confidence which his appearance inspired, and much of the sincere regard and friendship that came to him were begotten of his own sincerity and confidence in mankind.

His long and exceptionally successful career as a man of affairs, his energetic service in various important enterprises in the mercantile world, his public life, and his great trust in men, with his natural kindness of heart and nobility of character, combined to create in him what a famous philosopher aptly terms "a wide affinity" which impelled him naturally and without effort, with

neither deference nor condescension, to be to the great and less of the world, to the high and low, always the same courtly, genial, amiable gentleman.

His home life was beautiful and inspiring in its refinement and simplicity, and the same noble qualities which brought to him the love of his friends were possessed by his devoted wife and children. Indeed, I do not think there existed a more touching example of the best American home life in its Christianity and culture and devoted love than was formed by this family, and in the demise of the kind and loving husband and father they are indeed sorely bereaved.

Others here will speak of his valuable and faithful services in this House. Seldom has "the common duty of each day been more uncommonly well done" than by Mr. HOFFECKER. His capacity for ceaseless work was remarkable, his large private interests combining with his duties here to keep him constantly engaged, while his interest in humanity and his unselfish desire to help others less fortunate impelled him to find ample time to help countless of his acquaintances; and it was while faithfully attending to his duties as a Representative of his people that he passed away.

His personality and character won for him countless friends in all walks of life, who sincerely loved him and who deeply mourn the loss of his companionship and of the helpfulness of his Christian character and great kind heart; and though many of them could praise his virtues more eloquently than I, yet none could be more grateful for the friendship of the companion who has been called away and whose memory I revere.

Our Relations with Cuba.

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,

OF NEW YORK.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 7, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 13850) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902.

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will avail myself of the latitude permitted in the discussion of this bill to direct the attention of the House to the Cuban question; and in that connection it is both interesting and instructive to consider the situation in Egypt, because there is a close parallel between the circumstances out of which that situation arose and the circumstances of our present relations with Cuba. There is no subject upon which the British Government has been more generally and constantly and severely criticised than its continued occupation of the land of the Pharaohs. It went there in 1882 in order to suppress the insurrection of Arabi Bey and to strengthen the tottering authority of the Khedive Tewfik Pasha, and when it went there the Government, then in the hands of Mr. Gladstone, made the same blunder which Congress made in adopting the Teller resolution. It declared that the occupation of Egypt was only temporary, and that it would cease when its purpose had been served. That was eighteen years ago, and it has not ceased yet; but so great and manifold have been the benefits of which it has been the source that every intelligent observer has been constrained to acknowledge that its cessation is neither to be expected nor desired. Yet the British Government was just as formally and strongly pledged to evacuate Egypt as the Teller resolution pledged us to evacuate Cuba, and even more so, as the assurance which Mr. Gladstone originally made in one of those fits of sentimentality to which he was periodically subject was weakly and unwisely reiterated by more than one of his successors. But the British forces remain in Egypt and no one doubts that they will indefinitely stay there.

Those of our people who are now engaged in demanding the fulfillment of what they are pleased to describe as "our solemn pledge," the pledge in question being the Teller amendment to the declaration of war in 1898, are making the mistake of regarding that as the only pledge involved in our dealings with Cuba. The truth is that it is one of many and by no means the most important. One general proposition was that a state of anarchy existed in Cuba; that the conditions of barbarism there prevalent were a menace to civilization; that it devolved upon us as the guardian of human liberty and free political institutions in the Western Hemisphere to correct the intolerable evils and set up in their place the institutions of enlightened government. Mr. TELLER's amendment merely explained our motive and disclaimed the very least infusion of rapacity or selfishness therein. As a

matter of fact, our dominant purpose was that of destroying a régime under which savagery flourished in its most odious and cruel forms and setting up instead the machinery of a true and lasting civilization. We shall not discharge in honor the duty we have voluntarily assumed by a mere technical observance of the Teller resolution. We have promised to Cuba peace, order, equal rights, security for life and property, justice, and material progress. Does any sane man believe that these results are likely to be attained by approving the proposed Cuban constitution and surrendering the destinies of the island to the former insurgent leaders?

Mr. CHAIRMAN, it is unpleasant, but not surprising, that the revolutionary element which is in control of the Cuban constitutional convention should be antagonistic to the idea of recognizing in us any rights, or to the pressing present necessities of the United States, in their formulation of the basic law for their little country. It is quite unnecessary to mince words in speaking of the actions or purposes of colored and white leaders like Gomez, Cisneros, and Giberta. They may be honest and sincere enough, according to their lights, but the kind of liberty and independence of which they dream is the independent liberty of the successful revolutionary chief to own, run, and loot the state for his own and friends' advantage. The Cuban question is not one of party. Nothing could be worse for the Democracy than to take the opposite view of it. The birth of a new nation, on territory that God and nature intended to be a part of the United States, and which will be some day, is a matter not to be entangled in the meshes of domestic politics.

The constitutional convention delegates in Cuba should study, then seek to meet the wishes of the United States. After spending millions of dollars in money and sacrificing many lives we are in a position to make demands upon the island much more severe than any we will make, and still the Cubans would have no cause to complain. We are not seeking to govern the island, and we should not seek to, it is unnecessary; time will bring it to us, the Cubans themselves will petition it, but we are entitled to exercise a protectorate which will guard Cuba from foreign foes and prevent her from becoming the prey of other nations. We should have conceded to us the right to intervene in order that no harm may come to her and that a stable government may be maintained. We also should have the privilege of establishing naval stations.

All these things Cuba ought to be more than willing to grant, but it seems that the convention delegates have very little gratitude, and some of them are even talking loudly about possible war with the United States if we fail to get up and out unconditionally. That kind of talk is nonsensical; but it shows what might very readily happen in the future if a few hot-headed individuals should be permitted to control Cuban affairs, and should the island be allowed to cut away absolutely from the United States. To prevent any possible trouble in the future we should insist on our right to intervene. We neither wish Cuba to get into difficulties with foreign powers nor to be continually torn up with internal quarrels.

But the constitution makers do not see it in that light. They object to any supervision on our part. From their actions it would appear they consider the United States to be the obligee, and not Cuba.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, this may be accounted for by the fact that Cuba is passing through the usual crisis that confronts a state laboring under a violent and sudden change of government. At present the island is controlled by an element without patriotism, little honor, and still less commercial standing in the community—political adventurers, in the main, whose sole hope is to govern as a means of gratifying their own ambitions and with the expectation of political preferment. Until this element is turned down, leaving a clear road to the better and more conservative and commercial element, Cuba will be in a state of turmoil.

Of course, the United States might permit these people to try the Santo Domingo idea in Cuba. It might allow them thus to demonstrate their unfitness and their irresponsibility. But by so doing it would condemn the island to the depths of Santo Domingo instead of raising it to the heights of honest and stable government. By some of our own people this is regarded as the best policy. Yet, in the light of recent history, the American people could never hope to justify themselves for such a wanton and criminal course, even though it should be followed at the instigation of the present Cuban convention.

Cuba is rich in natural resources, but money is needed for its development, and capitalists will not unlock their money chests until adequate protection is promised for investments. In other words, until the present political agitation is checked the natural development will not be begun in earnest and the island assume that state of prosperity to which she is entitled.

It may be that there are some of the better class of Cubans who have followed closely the course of events in this country, and particularly our administrative policies as exemplified in Porto

Rico and the Philippines, who entertain a strong feeling of distrust as to America's real purpose regarding Cuba. But for the existence of that sentiment of distrust the plan for annexation of the island to the United States might to-day command much stronger support than that openly accorded it in Cuba. Despite undeniable blundering in the past, however, it ought not to be too late to make it clear to the great majority of her islanders that their best interests call for union with our great Republic.

Unfortunately for practical results it is too late to inquire into the besotted infatuation of those of our authorities who invested such notoriously unfit men with political influence and power in Cuba, thereby insuring the present lamentable and threatening situation. The mischief has been done—done, seemingly, deliberately and persistently—and we are face to face with its vicious consequences. It is obvious now that the pets of Brooke and Wood are incapable of leading public sentiment in Cuba to construct a governmental system for that island for which we can afford to make ourselves responsible. It is obvious that the operation of the proposed Cuban constitution under the auspices of the old insurgent leaders must inevitably lead to chaos—to conditions which we have pledged ourselves to prevent. And it is clearly a waste of time to argue and palaver over the Teller amendment while infinitely higher and more pressing duties call upon us for recognition. What is needed in Cuba, and what we are bound to provide, is a dispensation of peace, order, security, and protection of vested interests. If we fall short in this our national honor will be smirched, our national dignity compromised.

Mr. Chairman, we will be justified in asserting the right to be consulted by the Cuban government so far as its relations to foreign powers are concerned. I do not concede that our promise to the people of Cuba implies absolute independence, irrespective of the conditions existing in the island, and in view of the cost of Cuba's freedom to this country in treasure and in blood, gratitude should impel her to lean upon America as her best friend and protector. That there are influential leaders in Cuba that do not take this view of the matter, and, instead, are already talking of fight, is a phase of the Cuban situation unpleasant to even Cuba's best wishers in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, a United States protectorate will give to Cuba the reality of independence, to the United States the surety of order, of solvency, of justice, and of peace in Cuba, and to the world notice that the United States may be considered as on guard over the island, alike to prevent it from being an occasion of trouble to this nation and to prevent other nations from making any designs on Cuba an occasion of trouble to ourselves. Local independence, domestic control, with suzerainty of the treaty-making and debt-incurring power in the United States, should satisfy the people of Cuba and bring order out of the confusion which has reigned there for centuries.

Such a protectorate over Cuba is as necessary as it is considerable. In few countries in the world are the elements for intelligent government less and those for unintelligent government more than in Cuba. Liberty itself is worth only the value of it in order, honesty, justice, decency, and obedience to regulated law. Liberty other than that is license, and a license that is a curse not greater to those that have it than to those affected by relations of neighborhood, of commerce, or of interest with it. The world knows the United States, but knows not Cuba. Cuba knows the United States, but knows not the world. For herself Cuba should lean on the United States, and to the world the United States will stand for Cuba, saying, "I have underwritten it, and shall be responsible for it."

These conditions magnify and suffice for statesmanship. With us liberty means social order, the supremacy of the law, respect for government, for property, and for human life. What it means with the Cubans, who now are clamoring against us, we can only assume from their past conduct and their present anxiety to be freed from our restraining influence. We will not deny them liberty, but we will forbid them license. This accounts for their discontent. Moreover, we can not afford to forget we have an interest in the suppression of yellow fever in Cuba greater than was our interest in the removal of the Spanish Government. We have a right to insist upon the protection of our country from that pest and menace of Cuba by the Cuban government from the outset.

Mr. Chairman, Cuba will have its own government and its own flag and be in virtual control of its own destinies in the course of a few months if she will lay aside suspicions that reflect upon her far more than they do upon the United States, and proves by her actions that she is capable of performing the duties of a civilized, enlightened people; but instead of doing this she proves her unfitness for the independence she asks by ignoring the plain fact that no nation ever did, and no nation ever will or ought to do, what she seems to expect the United States to do for her.

Mr. Chairman, it is not pleasant to have to urge upon one whom you have greatly benefited the duty of manifesting a reasonable gratitude for such benefits, but it would be well were Cuba to show a bit more appreciation of what this Government has done

for her. There is not another great power in the world of to-day that would go to war for the purpose of freeing a weaker nation, and thereafter, instead of subjugating that nation to its own yoke, help it willingly in the establishment of its independent government right at its benefactor's doors and where it will be capable of causing infinite trouble and unceasing international complication in the future to its savior.

The people of Cuba should not permit their ungrounded prejudices against this country to turn them, snarling and snapping at the hand which saved them from a tyrant's rod of oppression. They have a sacred duty to perform toward us, just as we have toward them. A bit of gratitude and friendly feeling on the part of the people whom we brought out of bondage would be a pleasant thing to contemplate just now. But if the people of Cuba are blind to their obligations to us, if they refuse to consider our rights and to appreciate the dangers to which they expose us, then all this maudlin protest against our enforcement of peace, security, and stability in Cuba is as absurd as the hysterical clamor to which we weakly yielded in making war on Spain. We have assumed grave obligations in this matter. We have demolished the only sovereignty that ever existed in the island since Spain's discovery in the fifteenth century, and we can not, without dishonor and disgrace, repudiate the responsibilities we have assumed. The Teller amendment of 1898 contains the least of our pledges. It is a mere overture of altruism—a luxury to be enjoyed only when we are in honor free.

To the fact that ours is the most free, the most liberal, the most benevolent, the most progressive, and the most growing nation in the world, the Republic can point with confidence, gratitude, and legitimate pride. On the fact that the great mass of its citizens love it for being that, and serve it to keep it that, the Republic safely and calmly leans. The Republic can forgive its traducers or misinterpreters, can protect them and can hope for the coming of a better mood of mind to them. But even the Republic can not suspend or divert the laws of growth in its own case. It must go forward.

The reconstruction of Cuba, to be lasting, must be right and thorough. The colonial failures of other countries and unhappy experience within our own, by precipitating results after the civil war, must admonish us to move with sagacity and with honor, and, therefore, to move without hurry, without impulse, and without fear.

Mr. Chairman, under present conditions I can see but one thing to do, and that is for this Government to be firm in dealing with Cuba. We have great interests at stake; we should therefore make our requests and desires known to Cuba, and thereafter, if necessary, these requests should be put in the form of an ultimatum. I can not believe it will be necessary to go this far, for the probability is that Cuba will yield; but if she does not do so readily, then our troops must remain until an absolute understanding is reached.

In pursuing this course our Republic will be maintaining its promises with dignity, decision, and equity. Unworthy of its blessings indeed is he who to-day feels not thankful that they may soon be extended over further millions of people in Cuba with results for good that must be felt to the end of time.

Baltimore and Potomac Railroad—Elimination of Grade Crossings.

SPEECH

OF

HON. ADOLPH MEYER,

OF LOUISIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 7, 1901,

On the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1929) to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings on the line of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company, in the city of Washington, D. C., and requiring said company to depress and elevate its tracks, and to enable it to relocate parts of its railroad therein, and for other purposes.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I felt it to be my duty as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia to give my support to the bill (S. 1929, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session) to provide for eliminating grade crossings on the line of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company in the city of Washington, and requiring the said company to depress and elevate its tracks, and to enable it to relocate parts of its railroad therein, and which has now been reported in amended form by the conferees.

That the passage of the measure is justified and required by the public interests I have no sort of doubt. So far as the railroad company is concerned, I have no prejudices either for or against it. I would not be willing to do the company an injustice on the one hand, or, on the other, to favor any legislation for their benefit that did not at the same time harmonize with and promote the general interest of the people and especially of this District. I may add further that I have no pet scheme to promote.

This question of eliminating the grade crossings by some feasible mode has been before the District Committee for years. Naturally there has been considerable diversity of opinion in respect to plans for effecting it, and the result is that an object the immense importance of which all persons are willing to concede has been postponed. I mean the preservation of human life. In every great city of the world, I believe, certainly in London, Paris, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and elsewhere, railroads run with their loads of passengers into the very heart of the city, but due care is taken not to endanger human life. It is a reproach to our legislation that this matter has not been cared for long ago.

It appears to me that in dealing with this subject the first question to be considered is the safety of human life. I speak not only in the interest of the public, but of the corporation using this franchise. The corporation is deeply interested in settling the matter upon a proper basis. The second matter—and a most important one for our consideration—is the convenience of the traveling public in entering or leaving the city. When I say the traveling public, I mean not only the people of this city, but the citizens of the United States who may have occasion to visit the city of Washington. There was a time in the memory of living men when Washington and no other American city had a railroad. The stagecoach did the whole business.

There was a time later when, for quite a while, a traveler on his way to New York would have to stop and ride 3 or 4 miles through the streets of Philadelphia and take a train on the other side of that city. Through travel has disposed of all that business. You can not halt the traveler on the outskirts of a great city and compel him to take a long and expensive ride to a hotel or to his home. You have to let him come to a depot in a reasonably convenient locality, as does London, Paris, New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago. Life is not made up entirely of flower gardens, singing birds, and aesthetics. There must be a plan for utility. We are not legislating for the rich exclusively, but if we were, even they would prefer a short, safe ride to their homes to an æsthetic drive through the Mall.

Now, that the public and you yourselves insist on having the railroad, how will you bring it into the city and where will you stop it and locate its depot? Can you have a better general line of entrance to the city, where you will work less disturbance to important interests, than a route like the one selected by the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad and the one marked out by this bill? Can you find anywhere a more convenient location for its depot? Remember that this system is one of the great railroads of the United States, connecting this city with the North, the East, the West, and the South.

Remember that there was a time, and that not so very far back, when this city had but one railroad connecting it with the North and the West—the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. That was not a very healthy condition of affairs for us, considering the matter either from a business or from a military standpoint. It was at that time the people of the national capital were gladdened by the construction of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad, the extension of the great Pennsylvania Railroad system to this city. It was at that time that the board of alderman and the common council of Washington City located the railroad depot on its present site and that this location was confirmed by act of Congress approved May 21, 1872.

Is it unreasonable to suggest that the construction of this additional railroad—a great competing line—had much to do with the development of the national capital, its increase in business, population, and beauty?

Listening to some of the debate on this bill one would suppose that the only thing to be considered in this and like questions is the question of ornamentation and the preservation of every square foot of the Mall, so as to please the eye and permit a grand pleasure drive. One of the critics of this bill in an official report informs us positively that "Washington will always be a residence city, and never a commercial metropolis."

One of the speakers in the discussion tells us that the city of Washington is not a commercial city, ought not to be one, and he hopes never will be one. I do not think these gentlemen have fully apprehended present conditions or divined the future. This city is growing rapidly and steadily. Its commerce or business is increasing. Its manufactures are already considerable and are increasing. Experience has demonstrated that the capitals of all great countries grow at a very rapid rate.

It is true that London has easy access to the sea, but hydraulic

science may do as much for Washington in the future. Look at Paris, an interior city without any navigable stream—an inland city—with its vast business industries, manufactures, and wealth. Look at Berlin and Vienna—with their wonderful growth and great trade. Look at Philadelphia, and compute how much of her great wealth and population is due to an export trade by water. It is safe to say that this city will have a great and increasing growth, which will be proportionate to that of this great country. It will have something more than grand public buildings, tasteful residences, broad avenues, flower gardens, and the like.

It will have, as it already has, its utilitarian side. It will have workshops, industries, poor people as well as rich, and all these must be cared for. Washington can not well expand to the south, for the Potomac lies in the way, but it will expand east, north, and northwest. Its population will overflow in all these directions. It will cross the Potomac to the west. Not merely one bridge, but ere very many years there will be three or four bridges connecting this city with the magnificent and beautiful country lying west of the Potomac. For all these extensions I hope adequate parks will be provided. The poor, the larger class of people of only moderate means, who can not quit town or drive about in carriages, will want breathing places. The children will want playgrounds. You will have to do as much for them as London does for her poor people with her spacious parks. They are not connecting parks, but they are there all the same.

This subject of eliminating grade crossings on the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad has presented difficulties, but at last we have a bill which the District Commissioners favor, and which is favored also by the press and people of Washington City. It is also acceptable to the railroad company. It is fair to the company, and it ought to be fair. The bill is sustained by the officials of the District, whose knowledge of the general subject and of every detail of it can not be questioned any more than their disposition to guard the public interests.

The main objection urged to the bill is that it allows the railroad company to retain the site it now has for its depot, and that they are allowed a few more acres of land in order to build a grand and commodious depot adequate to the wants of the traveling public. I consider this an argument in its favor. We want a large depot for the public, and we want it near where it is now, convenient for the public to use. In point of fact, the company ought not only to be allowed, but required to construct the depot in the locality designated by this bill.

They are willing to do it, I know; but if the company was unwilling, I would insist on it in the public interest. As for the question of money, I hear nobody suggesting that they should pay for this additional 14 acres. Considering the great convenience to the people of this District and of the Union by this improvement, I would not stop for one moment to demand money for it. If it were a bad arrangement for the general public, I would not let them have it at any price.

And now who is injured by this location and arrangement? It is said that the Mall will be destroyed. This is all fanciful. Ample provision is made in the bill even for the pleasure drive, though that is not, in my opinion, a vital matter. The old Mall is now divided up into a series of parks by streets running south and it is not proposed by anyone, as I understand, to close them. You will still have a series of parks, the whole aggregating five or six hundred acres, and these I take to be ample for South Washington. They are more than enough for the population, present and prospective. The people living north of Pennsylvania avenue do not use them at all, and are less likely to do so hereafter than now. The electric cars carry the people from the body and center of the city north, east, and west out of the city. None of them care to go to the Mall.

Sir, behind this clamor and outcry of a few persons I found no public sentiment and certainly not any public necessity. The people of this city favor this bill. It seems to me the wishes and opinions of this people, who are unrepresented on this floor, ought to have great weight with us in disposing of this matter. Their leading citizens and business men have studied it for years and know more about it than we do.

I believe there is no division of opinion as to the necessity of a new bridge across the Potomac, and the argument for a separate highway bridge from the railroad bridge appears to be very strong. A highway bridge is needed at this point. One has stood there for many years. There is a large and increasing intercourse with Alexandria, which is a growing point, and I do not consider this proposition as standing in the way of the proposal for a bridge to be situated higher up the Potomac. If there was any conflict, preference ought to be given to the connection with Alexandria and the country adjacent to both cities.

When this legislation shall go into effect and these improvements shall have been completed, I believe it will be a matter of wonder and amazement that anyone seriously opposed the bill under

which this question received its solution. As to what is the public interest in this matter, I am fully in accord with the views of the District Commissioners and the people of Washington City. If anyone will read the clear and dispassionate statement of the District Commissioners on this subject, it seems to me he can not fail to be convinced that a correct, common-sense conclusion of this question has been at last reached. [Applause.]

Senator from North Carolina.

SPEECH
OF
HON. MARION BUTLER,
OF NORTH CAROLINA.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Saturday, March 2, 1901.

The Senate having under consideration the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. BUTLER said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I gave notice several days ago that I would address the Senate before the close of the present session on the resolution which I offered some time since and on which my colleague addressed the Senate on yesterday. The resolution, as Senators know, was to refer the credentials of Mr. F. M. Simmons, Senator-elect, to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for investigation. I do not desire at this late hour to detain the Senate a moment longer than duty and the importance of the subject demand, but I understand that this is the last appropriation bill, and I very much fear from the present outlook that the hour of adjournment will arrive before this bill has reached a vote. Therefore I am forced to take advantage of this opportunity to address the Senate as briefly as possible on the resolution referred to.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That the paper that purports to certify to the lawful election of Mr. F. M. Simmons to be a Senator of the United States from North Carolina for six years, beginning March 4 next, be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

My colleague in his speech delivered on yesterday covered very fully in a general way the facts and the law which form the basis of this resolution. It would be impossible in a speech of any reasonable length to cover in detail a history of the recent suffrage campaign in North Carolina so as to set forth the different methods employed in different parts of the State and in different counties and in different precincts in overturning the will of a large majority of the people at the so-called election in August last. I shall therefore later on in my remarks, instead of attempting to cover the whole field, take up the election methods resorted to by the Democratic machine, under the direction of Mr. Simmons, in only one county, and that is my native county of Sampson. I take this county for two reasons: First, because I am personally familiar with the facts, and can therefore state them of my own knowledge; and second, because the crimes against the "republican form of government" committed in that county were of a less grievous nature than those committed in a majority of the counties of the State. A very large majority of the white people of Sampson County are Populists, and over a two-thirds majority of the legally qualified voters of the county are opposed to the Democratic party. Therefore it would be impossible for many of the flagrant crimes of intimidation and violence which were committed in many counties where the Democratic machine was numerically the stronger to be committed there. Thus, if it appears from the facts that I shall present from that county that the result was secured by fraud and corruption, it will be apparent that the result was accomplished by methods more revolutionary in a majority of the counties of the State.

Before proceeding to a discussion of the facts with reference to the election methods in Sampson County, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to two important points that will govern the Senate in the consideration of this case, whatever the facts may be. First, while the Senate has in every contested-election case from the beginning of the Government up to now failed to go behind the returns from a legislature in trying the title of a person to a seat in this body, yet no Senate committee and no action of the Senate has ever yet declared that this body would not do so if the time arrived when it was justified in doing it. In fact, this body has always taken the position, and has taken the pains to so declare, that it would do that very thing whenever the time and occasion arose that demanded it. In the Turpie

case the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections concluded its report with the following:

The majority of the committee do not mean to be understood as now committing ourselves to an opinion upon the question whether the Senate can not refuse to seat a claimant who owes his election to a legislative body which is itself the result of fraud or crime—which has overcome the true will of the people—even if it have possessed itself of legislative authority and of the technical evidence of a rightful character, or whether the judgments of such a body as to the title to seats of its individual members are entitled to any respect whatever. If that question should hereafter unhappily arise, it will be dealt with on its own merits.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] prepared the report of the committee in that case. The question as to whether or not a legislature has been elected, as a result of fraud or crime, which has overcome the true will of the people has unhappily arisen, and is now presented squarely to the Senate. Therefore, in the language of the committee in that case, "the Senate must now deal with it on its own merits." In a later case, known as the Scott case, the Senate committee in its report says:

A majority of the committee do not mean to decide that the Senate could not refuse a seat to a claimant who is elected by a legislature which is itself directly and plainly the result of force and fraud.

So the Senate committee and the Senate itself have always taken the position that while in no case yet presented have they felt justified in going behind the returns of a legislature, yet they have always expressly declared that it was competent for the Senate to do so, and that the Senate should do so whenever it was shown that the will of a majority of the people had been overturned and the legislature claiming to elect a Senator had held office as a result of fraud or force or crime.

Now, there is just such a case here presented. The showing of facts made by my colleague justify and make it the duty of the Senate to go behind the returns of the legislature and investigate the title of the sitting members composing the majority and to determine whether or not the majority do not hold power as a result of fraud or force or crime. There has never yet been a case like this before the Senate, for there has never yet been a case where there was such flagrant frauds and force and crime to override the will of the people and defy the constitution of the State and the Constitution of the United States, to say nothing of the laws of the State and of the United States.

Even the present governor of North Carolina, who claims to have been elected at the recent August election (so called), announced on the stump during his canvass of the State that he desired to be elected by lawful means, but that if he could not, he was determined to be elected by fraud and force. What were the lawful means to which he referred? They were by the use of the most unfair, dishonest, thieving, and unconstitutional election law that ever disgraced the statute books of any State in the Union; an election law that did not require the registrars to take an oath to support either the constitution and laws of the State or the Constitution and laws of the United States or to obey even the provisions of the election law, which was designed to rob a majority of the voters of their elective franchise; an election law that provided that the registrar might ask dozens of questions wholly irrelevant, beyond those prescribed by the constitution of the State, as to the necessary qualifications of an elector, and which went further, and then gave the registrar power to refuse to register an applicant after he had not only complied with every constitutional requirement, but had answered every irrelevant and unconstitutional question which the registrar might ask, if, forsooth, the registrar was not satisfied he was a qualified voter, and which further denied any right of appeal from the arbitrary decision of such an unsworn election official clothed with autocratic and tyrannical powers; an election law which denied to all parties besides the Democratic party the right to select and have placed on any election board a representative of their own choosing; an election law which did not provide a single penalty for registrars and judges of election for unlawfully refusing to register voters or for unlawfully and willfully denying them the right to vote on election day, or for miscounting or throwing out their votes when the vote was being canvassed; an election law which contained a section denying to an elector who had been unlawfully denied the right to register or vote the right of the writ of mandamus, thus closing the doors of the court to a citizen who had been disfranchised and outraged in a Republic like ours.

Mr. President, I can not take the time of the Senate to recite the monstrous provisions of this law from beginning to end, but the above citations will serve as examples, and surely they are enough alone to shock the sense of justice of any and every Senator who believes in justice or has the least regard for the fundamental principles of a republican form of government. So when the Democratic candidate for governor claimed that he desired to be elected by lawful means, he meant by an election law which was prepared with malice aforethought to subvert and overthrow the sovereign will of the people of North Carolina, but realizing that the majority against him and his machine was so great, he was constrained

to admit the necessity for fraud and force to supplement the infamous workings of such a law.

Now, Mr. President, who was the author of this election law and the chief conspirator behind its most infamous execution? It was Mr. F. M. Simmons, who was chairman of the Democratic State committee, and who now claims a seat in this body as a result of the workings of such an election law, supplemented by fraud and force. Therefore, it is not only the right, but, in my opinion, it is the highest duty of the Senate to do now what it has always declared it would do, namely, to investigate the title of the members of the legislature when it appeared that they held their seats as a result of fraud or force or corruption. I say, Mr. President, that on this ground the Senate can and should proceed with the investigation that my resolution calls for.

But, Mr. President, there is another ground on which this investigation can be made. It is not necessary for the Senate to take the position which I have outlined above in order to adopt my resolution and refer the credentials of Mr. Simmons to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and it would not be necessary for the committee to make the investigation along that line in order to find that Mr. Simmons was not entitled to a seat in this body. Why? Because the Senate has held that whenever a man claiming a seat in this body was himself guilty of bribery or any other crime that would unfit one to be a Senator, or that he was so connected with fraud, force, corruption, and crime committed in the election as to make him particeps criminis, if not the chief instigator, that then he would not be a proper person to sit in this body, and that, too, regardless of the fact that he was elected or not elected by a legislature that was unlawfully elected. In the Clark case the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, in a unanimous report, declared that if a person claiming a seat in this body were elected properly by a legally constituted legislature, yet, if that party had himself been guilty of bribing even one voter, and even if that vote did not in any way affect his election, then he would be declared to be disqualified to sit in this body.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator from North Carolina allow me a word right here?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Since this matter is under discussion, I wish to express my opinion that the Senate can go behind the returns of a legislature whenever it thinks the election of a person who presents himself for a Senator was unlawful for any reason.

Mr. BUTLER. I am very glad to have the opinion of such a distinguished lawyer as the Senator from Connecticut on that point, and it seems that there can be no question as to the fact that a large majority of the best lawyers as well as a large majority of all the Senators of this body will hold the same view.

But, Mr. President, I had just passed from that point; I had just finished calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that the committee and this body have always declared that whenever a case was presented that raised a question as to the election of a legislature by fraud, force, or corruption, etc., that then the Senate would go behind the returns of the legislature that elected the person who claimed a seat in this body. It seems that there can be no question as to that point. The only question there can be is as to whether or not that time has arrived, and the facts which my colleague presented and which I will present most abundantly establish that fact.

When the Senator from Connecticut interrupted me I was on the second point; that is, that the Committee on Privileges and Elections of this body, and the Senate also have taken the position that whenever a person claiming a seat in this body has been guilty of conduct to make him an improper person to sit in this body, that then it would be the duty of the Senate after investigation to declare his seat vacant. Therefore I ask that this resolution be adopted, referring the credentials of Mr. F. M. Simmons to the Committee on Privileges and Elections on the second ground as well as on the first ground, in order that the committee may investigate his conduct as chairman of the Democratic committee in the last campaign and his responsibility for the crimes against liberty, civilization, and humanity then committed, and even to extend their investigation as to his fitness further, if necessary.

Mr. President, the Senate will refuse a seat in this body to a man who has been guilty of bribing one voter; what will it do with a man claiming a seat in this body who has been guilty of conduct a hundred times worse? Is bribing one voter or one member of the legislature as great a crime against republican institutions and against society as unlawfully disfranchising thousands and tens of thousands of American citizens? The briber does not disfranchise the voter; he even recognizes the right of the voter to his vote. He simply seduces the voter into making merchandise of his vote for a consideration. The voter is not disfranchised by fraud or force; he is left as a free agent. If he sells his vote, he does it of his own volition. It is true that a crime has been committed—a crime by the seller and a crime by the buyer; but it

does not compare with or measure up to the crime of robbing a citizen of his birthright.

Mr. President, the crime of disfranchisement—illegal and unconstitutional disfranchisement—which was conceived, planned, and executed by Mr. Simmons in the late election in North Carolina is only a small part of his offense against society and republican institutions and Christian civilization. The unlawful, violent, revolutionary, and bloody execution of his infamous plan was, if anything, greater. If a man who bribes one voter is disqualified to sit in this body, then the man who now claims a seat here representing North Carolina is a hundred times more disqualified.

Mr. President, the Senate is face to face with this question. It is one that can not be passed over. It must be investigated and determined. As I have shown, there are two grounds for such investigation; either one of them is sufficient. This is a matter about which I have but little personal interest. What I am now saying is from a sense of public duty; and it is the public duty that devolves upon the Senate—indeed, a grave public duty. If a matter of this kind can be allowed to pass, then, indeed, the foundation stones of the Republic can be undermined without protest or redress.

If the Senate should decide to proceed to investigate this matter, then the facts can be and will be fully presented to the election committee. At the present time I will ask simply to put into the RECORD the facts relating to one county, to which I have referred above. Immediately after the close of the late August election the election frauds in Sampson County were reviewed in an article written by my brother, Maj. George E. Butler, and published in two editions of a paper I own and publish, namely, the Raleigh Caucasian and the Clinton Caucasian. The article is as follows:

THE PEOPLE OF SAMPSON COUNTY INDIGNANT—THE SIMMONS DEMOCRATIC MACHINE FOREVER DOOMED IN THAT COUNTY—ONE THOUSAND WHITE MEN DEPRIVED OF THEIR VOTES BY THE DEMOCRATIC CANVASSING BOARD—FIVE HUNDRED QUALIFIED VOTERS REFUSED REGISTRATION—A GRAPHIC STORY OF DEMOCRATIC OUTRAGES—THE COUNTY STILL POPULIST, AFTER THE GIGANTIC STEAL, BY 659 MAJORITY—NAMES OF THE MACHINE GIVEN—THE FIGHT WAS STRICTLY BETWEEN WHITE MEN—THE INVASION OF ARMED RED SHIRTS REVOLUTIONARY AND WILL BE CONDEMNED.

The Populist majority in Sampson County by Democratic count was 1,400, a gain of nearly 1,000 in the past two years. The fight in Sampson was between white men with the ratio more than two to one in favor of the Populists, and the increased majority this year was caused by the shameful conduct of the Democrats by wearing red shirts and importing all the red-shirt cut-throats and tramps in adjoining counties to invade our county for the purpose of terrorizing our people and driving them from their honest convictions.

The leaders of the Democratic party in Sampson County, and especially in Clinton, encouraged and protected this howling mob to the disgust of all decent people in the county and to their utter rout and repudiation at the polls.

With a fair registration and honest count Sampson would have gone Populist by not less than 2,500 majority. After all the stealing they could possibly do on the day and night of election we then carried the county by 1,400 majority, according to their own count.

This majority was appalling to them. They did not expect it. They hoped by their stealing on the day and night of election, together with their fraudulent registration, to carry the county. They decided that this big majority must be reduced by the canvassing board on Saturday, and here in the court-house of the county, a venerable temple of justice, and in the broad, open daytime, in the presence of several hundred good people of the county, there was perpetrated the blackest and most damnable outrage ever witnessed in a civilized country before. The highway robber who sits by the roadside for his unsuspecting victim, or the chicken thief who crouches in the henhouse in the nighttime, or, meaner still, the sheep thief who walks off with an innocent, crying lamb on his back—any of these in the estimation of good people in a Christian community would be regarded as honorable men and gentlemen compared to the measly, gang that called themselves the canvassing board of Sampson County and polluted the county's court-house on Saturday, August 5. After taking a solemn oath to do their duty before God and man and to administer justice to all parties, they proceeded while their breath was still hot on the Book to throw out Lisbon Township with 247 qualified voters, Turkey Township with 228 qualified voters, Herrings Township with 213 qualified voters, Honeycutts Township with 400 qualified voters, making a grand total of 1,088 qualified votes stolen by a Sampson County Democratic canvassing board in one day.

The Populist party includes more than twice as many white men as the Democratic party in this county, and own more than twice the real and personal property of the county, and poll more than twice as many votes as the Democratic party, yet the Populists were denied representation on the canvassing board and in several of the townships were refused a judge of election, but appointed Democrats in their stead. The registrars were all Democrats, and every scheme and subterfuge was resorted to by the registrars to prevent Populists and Republicans from registering. Voters applying for registration were asked all kinds of foolish and absurd questions and required to answer upon their oath. Hundreds were denied registration because they could not give their exact age in days and months, though they swore to their exact age in years and had been voting regularly more than a quarter of a century. Others were denied registration who swore to their exact age but could not tell what year they were born. Others who swore to the day and year in which they were born and gave their exact age, but reference to the old registration books did not correspond either in the day or the year given, were denied registration. Nearly all were asked if they had listed and paid their poll tax, and if not they were disqualified, when the constitutional requirements to vote in the election law makes no such requirements.

In many townships men were solemnly asked upon their oath about their private family affairs. How he and his wife got along together, and other foolish and absurd questions, and in many instances if he was not living with his wife, or had not been divorced, or domestic troubles of any kind, he was promptly disfranchised. In Hall Township a white man was disfranchised because he plowed half a day without a plow point. After they had denied several hundred in the county of registration in the way I have stated above

they drove many from the polls by intimidation and threats, and by requiring them to take solemn oaths about trivial and irrelevant matters and threatening them with criminal prosecution for perjury if they made an incorrect statement in any particular. Hundreds were registered on strips of paper, and these strips were afterwards destroyed by the registrar and their names never carried to the registration books at all.

All of this fraud and devilry was of no avail. The county grew stronger Populist every day. Some other plan must be resorted to. Their next scheme was larceny, and it began in this way:

HONEYCUTT TOWNSHIP.

This township, the old home of Senator BUTLER, is a large and strongly Populist township. On the last day of registration it could be easily seen by the Democrats that the Populists would have a tremendous majority in the township. W. A. Baggett, the Democratic registrar, on returning home in the evening of the last day of registration, claims that he was assaulted about dark in a few hundred yards of his home by a mob of men and made to surrender the registration books. He made no alarm and had no search made for the parties, but came to Clinton and reported the fact and had it wired to the State papers that the Populists had stolen the book, claiming his book showed a registered majority of 27 votes for the Democrats, while both Baggett, the registrar, and John D. Kerr, who sent out the libelous report, knew that it was untrue.

There was a legal election held in this township, each man taking an oath that he was registered, and the registrar, in the absence of the book, certifying to the same fact, and passed all that were properly registered to the polls, who voted. The actual count after the polls closed showed 29 Democrats and 241 Populists, and yet in the face of this John Kerr wired to the State papers the vile slander upon the Populists of Honeycutt Township that they had stolen the registration books, as the Democrats had 27 majority in the township. The canvassing board, at Mr. Kerr's request, threw out the entire vote of Honeycutt because they alleged that not all the men in the township voted on the day of election. The Populists then agreed to give them every man in the township whose name was on the registration books and count all not voting as Democrats. This they refused, and, after having stolen the registration book from their own registrar, committed the double crime by throwing out the entire vote of the township, thereby stealing 241 Populist votes in one precinct.

Their next crime was in Lisbon Township. This is another Populist stronghold. The first registrar the Democrats appointed was given his instruction how to proceed with the dirty work of cheating the Populist out of votes, and he was either afraid to do it or he was too honest to do it and, after registering about 50 voters, resigned.

The county board of elections then appointed another registrar. He registered a few and then he resigned, and instead of sending the book and his resignation direct to H. E. Faison, the chairman of the board, he expressed them to J. D. Kerr, to Clinton, via Wilmington, in order to cause delay; and consequently for about ten days there was no registrar or registration book in the township. The county board then appointed another, and after considerable delay he resigned; and then another was appointed, who was a practicing physician with many sick fever patients, and of course it was understood he was to resign.

The Democrats and Populists of the township then recommended another, who was a Democrat and who promised to serve as registrar, and he came to Clinton to receive his appointment, but the board refused to appoint him, but appointed another man who they knew beforehand would resign. Finally the last day of registration came and no registrar, and less than one-third of the qualified voters in the township registered. Every intelligent man in the township and Sampson County thoroughly understands the trouble in Lisbon Township. It was a contemptible conspiracy between the election board and the chairman of the Democratic party of this county and these registrars. And to complete their dirty work they took advantage of their own wrong and not only refused the 148 voters they had denied the privilege of voting, but threw out and refused to count the 90 votes properly registered and properly voting, thereby throwing out the entire vote of this township, consisting of 247 votes.

The cause of their cowardly and niggardly conduct is explained by the fact that the Populists had about 215 majority in the township.

Their next steal was at Turkey Township. This was also a Populist township, and the election passed off quietly and quietly and the registrar and judge declared that it was a fair election. When the canvassing board met Saturday the word was given and passed around by J. D. Kerr, the chief mogul and adviser for the sheepish-looking outlay, and Turkey Township, with its entire vote of 228, was dumped on the litter heap. Luke Kennedy, the Democratic registrar and brother of the Populist candidate for the senate, J. T. Kennedy, in order to throw out the township and defeat his own brother, took the Holy Book and swore that there was intimidation at the polls, but said he was not intimidated, and when asked who was, could not name a single man or produce a single witness; yet, upon this hearsay evidence, which is inadmissible in any court, and evidence which would be incompetent and insufficient even if it were admissible, this board threw out Turkey Township. It was done at the instance of the registrar of that township, the ungrateful brother of the Populist candidate for the senate. It was an ex parte hearing and their conduct is without precedent in North Carolina and was without authority of law or shadow of evidence.

[The Caucasian is informed from another source that five or six witnesses were put on the stand to corroborate the Democratic registrar, and every one of them swore that there was no intimidation so far as they could see.]

They began their rascality again when they reached Herring Township. There was another strong Populist township and must be disposed of. The election passed off quietly and satisfactory to everybody until the count began. The election was held in an old shop and the registrar had himself roped off and crouched in one corner of the shop. When he began to count all alone, denying the right of any qualified voter seeing the count, as provided for in the election law, his reason for not allowing anyone to come near him was that it was "too hot." One of the boys on the outside, in order to give this "hot" registrar more air and ventilation, took off two planks on the side of the shop. This registrar, when his devilry could no longer be hidden, refused to continue the count, but it was promptly taken up and completed by other Democrats, who signed the returns and swore to their correctness. The judges and registrar who refused to make this count are indictable under the election law and the code for failure to perform their duties, but their refusing to do so did not invalidate the returns, as substitutes were appointed who promptly did the work and signed the returns. Yet this stuffy gang of county canvassers proceeded to throw out the entire township with 213 votes simply because the Populists had a majority of 53 votes.

This brings us to North Clinton Township. This township by actual count was Populist by 3 majority, and the Populist poll book in which was recorded the name of each Populist voter as he voted verified this statement by showing a majority of 3 votes for the Populists, yet the Democratic count in this township was from 90 to 111 majority for the Democrats. It was done in this way: The boxes were roped off and the count was made by the Democratic judge of election, who not only refused the presence of any spectators to

verify the count which was demanded, and which is required by the election law, but failed to read aloud the names on the tickets, and many of the tickets were counted for the Democrats without even being unfolded. This was done in the presence of a large number of Populist voters and Populist candidates for office, who, by this arbitrary ruling of the Democratic registrar and judge of election, enforced by Democratic bailiffs, were compelled to stand off and see the votes they cast counted for men they did not vote for, and counted for men they would have died before they would vote for. The Democratic judge counted all the boxes but the township box, and the Populist judge counted this box, which showed a majority of 3 votes for the Populists in North Clinton Township, and it was so recorded on the tally sheet when the count was made.

In the absence of the Populist judge, the registrar and Democratic judge changed this tally sheet after it was signed, to show a Democratic majority of about 40 votes. This was done to prevent too great a variance between the township box and the other boxes, and to prevent their rascality from being too noticeable. When this township was reached by the canvassing board, they passed it over without investigation, as it was one of the two Democratic townships in the county. The Populists thereupon demanded an investigation. It was at first refused, but through the appeals of the counsel for the Populists they finally agreed to admit evidence. The Populists preferred charges of fraud and irregularities in North Clinton Township, as follows:

First. The registrar and Democratic judge of election were not sworn on the day of election, as required by law. (The Populist judge was sworn.)

Second. The counting was done by the Democratic judge of election secretly and fraudulently, not permitting anyone to see the face of the tickets as they were being counted, as is required by law.

Third. The names on the tickets were not read aloud as required by law; in fact, the names on the tickets were not read at all, but counted "Populist" or "Democrat," as the said judge chose to count them.

Fourth. That the counting was so illegal and fraudulent as to change a Populist majority of 3 to a Democratic majority of from 90 to 111 votes. Upon these charges the counsel for the Populists began to introduce evidence, offering as many as six men of good character to prove each charge. The evidence began to pile up against these Democratic election officials, and it was black and sickening to behold. We demanded the tally sheets to prove our charges of fraud in the count and show that they had been tampered with since they were signed up on the night of the count. We offered the Populist judge to prove this against them, who would swear that two rows of the tally sheet had been erased, as well as the figures which showed a Populist majority in the township box, whereas it was made to count 40 Democratic majority. The Democratic registrar admitted having these tally sheets, but refused to produce them to verify our charge. The evidence was growing so large for these dirty fellows that they adjourned the board to meet again on Monday morning to continue the hearing. They met again on Monday, and upon coming together, to the dismay and disgust of all decent, fair-minded people, they passed a resolution to admit no more evidence against their crowd, for it was evident to everyone that a fair and full investigation of the Democratic registrars and judges in North and South Clinton townships would not only warrant throwing out both these townships, fraudulently counted Democratic, but would also forever destroy the character and reputation of every mother's son of them that participated in the steal.

Counsel for the Populists demanded the roll call of the board when they passed this disgraceful resolution, and demanded the same when the vote was taken to throw out the four Populist townships above, but to the disgust of all the spectators they scurried and squirmed and crouched behind each other and cast sheep-killing glances on the floor and voted "no," thereby showing to the world that they were ashamed to go on record before the withering scorn of an outraged and indignant people. These are grave charges we have preferred against the Sampson County canvassing board, and in order that the people may know upon whom to fasten their contempt we give their names in full below:

Chief adviser and ringmaster, J. D. O. Kerr. North Clinton, H. B. Chestnut; South Clinton, J. A. Beaman; Lisbon, John Johnson; Franklin, Bulie Moore; Taylors Bridge, Amos Smith; Turkey, Luke Kennedy; Piney Grove, Henry L. Clifton; Halls, Tom Hobbs; Newton Grove, J. W. Bryan; Westbrook, George Warren; Mingo, Eli Wilson; Herrings, Blake Warren; Honeycutt, W. A. Baggett; Dismal, Lewis Spell; Little Coharie, A. R. Harris; McDaniels, Owen Owens.

SOUTH CLINTON TOWNSHIP.

The Populists demanded an investigation in this township as well as in North Clinton, but an investigation was promptly refused by that immortal canvassing board whose names we have given above.

The township was also safely Populist, but was counted in for the Democrats by some 75 majority by the same fraudulent methods that were adopted in North Clinton Township, with the additional advantage that all the election judges were Democrats. There was no Populist representation at all, and the votes were counted by one man, who counted the tickets "Populist" or "Democrat" according to his own wicked proclivities.

I have enumerated above some of the crime and wickedness of the Democrats during this campaign, which has forever disgraced and damned them in this country. Our people, regardless of party, color, or previous conditions, are thoroughly indignant. They could not steal enough to capture the county or this senatorial district, and they never will. This county, whatever may be the alignment of parties in the future, is lost to the Democrats forever. Hundreds of men who voted the Democratic ticket in this election have denounced them and left them since the election.

As we have said above, the fight in this county was strictly between white men, and why our county should have been invaded by a foreign invasion of red shirts and cutthroats, who walked our streets with Winchesters and pistols, unmolested by police authorities, is a blistering shame, and when this lawless mob of red shirts, with guns on their shoulders and pistols in their belts and murder in their hearts, should be countenanced by civilized people and encouraged by professed Christians is a scene not witnessed since the Reformation, when Martin Luther thundered at the Diet at Worms and people were persecuted and burned at the stake for their honest convictions.

Here in the year of our Lord 1900 ministers of the gospel, who are chosen to teach religious toleration and lead people to Christ, were actually seen riding on horseback at the head of this lawless and irresponsible mob of red-shirt anarchists and murderers.

"When the fountains are destroyed, what shall the righteous do?"

The above article appeared on August 16 in both the Raleigh Caucasian and in the Clinton Caucasian and was a bombshell in the camp of the political enemy. At a mass meeting held in Clinton on August 18, at which meeting were assembled thousands of voters from Sampson, Duplin, Bladen, Cumberland, and Harnett counties, this article was indorsed, and the resolution indorsing said article was published in the Raleigh Caucasian and the Clinton Caucasian in the issue of August 23.

This bold publication and condemnation of the Democratic election machine of the State created quite a sensation among their organization. At first they attempted to vindicate themselves by force and threatened violence against the author of the article and the committee who indorsed it, but when their attempts in this direction were met by force, they decided to vindicate themselves by resorting to the courts, and accordingly instituted criminal libel proceedings not only against the author of the article above referred to, but also against 16 prominent Populists of Sampson County who constituted the committee that drew up the resolution indorsing the article.

This criminal proceeding was not instituted in the courts of Sampson County, where all of the defendants and prosecutors resided, but was brought in another county, to wit, the county of Duplin, where the Raleigh Caucasian and the Clinton Caucasian also circulated. At the December term of the Duplin superior court indictments were found against the author of the article and the 16 men who had indorsed it, and they were forced to leave their native county, together with 200 of their witnesses, and journey to a distant county to attend trial. Their defense was the truth of the charges contained in the article for the publication of which they were indicted, and the proceedings of that trial, written by a Democratic reporter and sent out to the Associated Press, are given below and are a fair report of the trial:

[Correspondence of the Morning Post.]

THE DUPLIN LIBEL CASE—DEFENDANTS WERE ANXIOUS FOR SPEEDY TRIAL—INDICTMENTS QUASHED AFTER ORDER OF CONTINUANCE AND DENIAL OF MOTION FOR REMOVAL TO SAMPSON COUNTY.

KENANSVILLE, N. C., December 7.

The famous libel suit from Sampson County, in which George E. Butler, John E. Fowler, Cicero H. Johnson, and 14 other prominent Populists were indicted for libel on John D. Kerr, H. B. Chesnut, and other prominent Democrats, came up for trial here in the superior court Thursday. There were able counsel on both sides of the case—Messrs. John E. Woodard, W. R. Allen, and Solicitor Duffy for the State, and Messrs. Stevens, Beasley & Weeks, Capt. C. M. Cooke, and F. R. Cooper, esq., for the defense.

A large number of witnesses from Sampson County and elsewhere were in attendance, and, on account of the character of the case and the prominence of the parties, there was much interest manifested in the outcome of the case. The prosecution, after calling their witnesses, announced that they were not ready for trial on account of the absence of a material witness and asked for a continuance. The most interesting phase of the case was here developed. The defense stated that they were ready and anxious for a trial, and claimed that the absent witness for whom the prosecution asked for a continuance was one J. C. Peterson, a student at Wake Forest College, who had not been subpoenaed until last Sunday, the day before the court convened. But one of the prosecutors having made affidavit as to the matter they could show by this witness, and it appearing material and necessary for the prosecution, the judge granted the motion for continuance.

The defendants insisted upon an immediate trial upon the grounds that the prosecution had not used due diligence to procure the attendance of their witnesses, while the defendants were ready with the attendance of 125 witnesses from the county of Sampson, by whom they insisted they were prepared to prove the truth of the charges contained in the alleged libelous article, and that it would be a great hardship upon the taxpayers of Duplin County, who had no interest in the prosecution, as well as upon the defendants and their witnesses.

The defendants' counsel further insisted that if the case should be continued it be removed to Sampson County, where all the prosecutors, defendants, and witnesses reside.

The defendants, failing to get the case tried at this term of court or to get it removed to Sampson County, moved to quash the bill of indictment for defects in the bill and for some irregularities in the grand jury. Upon investigation of these matters the motion to quash the bill was sustained by his honor Judge Moore, and the bills of indictment in both cases against the defendants were quashed, and judgment was entered discharging the defendants.

Why the prosecution resorted to legal technicality, as appears from the above report of the trial, and ran from a public investigation of the charges which they had brought is difficult to explain, except from the fact that they knew that the defendants were ready with their witnesses to prove all that was charged in the article and more, and therefore they could not afford for those facts to be made public and published to the world.

The article referred to was written immediately after the meeting of the canvassing board, and, while it is a terrific arraignment of the election methods in North Carolina in the August election, yet it is not a full write-up and does not show up all the disreputable methods resorted to by the Democratic machine in that campaign. The defendants were not only prepared to prove by their witnesses every material charge contained in the article, but were ready to prove in addition thereto many more facts about the election frauds in Sampson County, among which may be cited the following:

That in Lisbon Township they did not intend that there should be a full and fair registration of the qualified voters of that township, and prominent members of the election machine of Sampson County openly stated that prominent Populists in that township had made themselves officious in politics, and therefore they intended to see that these Populists did not have an opportunity to vote. In order to show that they had planned to carry out this general purpose, I will call attention to the fact that nine different registrars were appointed within three weeks in Lisbon Township and none of them could be persuaded by the voters of the township to keep the books and register the voters, but they resigned one after another as soon as they were appointed by the election

board of the county, and it is believed that many of these registrars resigned in pursuance of a general purpose and plan concocted with the election officials of the county, or they were appointed by the election board with the knowledge that they could not serve.

In short, there was a conspiracy to disfranchise the legally qualified voters of that township by denying them an opportunity to register; and this was simply a part of a general conspiracy, which was conceived by Mr. Simmons the State chairman, and put into execution by the same and by many different methods to secure the same results in the different townships and different counties over the entire State.

In Turkey Township, in addition to what is recited in the article, it could be shown that a voter went to the home of the registrar to register and found him at work on top of his house. He registered him while in this exalted position, without coming down and swearing the voter and placing his name on the book. The registrar, in transcribing this data from a slip of paper or a shingle when he had taken it to the book, made an error in the voter's age, and the voter was challenged on the day of election and threatened with a term in the State prison if he voted.

The Democrats secured a man to ride over this township a few days before the election and notify all of the illiterate voters (not Democrats) that their ages recorded on the new registration book did not correspond with their ages on the old registration book, and that if they voted they would be criminally prosecuted. On the day of election the Democratic registrar left his book and went out of the house and mounted a box and made a short speech, stating that the age of many of the voters was incorrectly stated on the books, and that if these people voted they did so at the risk of criminal prosecution. Consequently several voters were challenged when they went in to vote, not because they were not old enough to vote, but because the books may have shown them to be 39 years of age when, in fact, they were 40. Several left the booth without voting, but being advised by their friends that they were qualified voters and to return and vote, did so. And upon these facts the registrar, on the day the canvassing board met, swore that there was intimidation in the election in his township, and upon his unsupported testimony the entire vote of Turkey Township was thrown out.

In Herrings Township a citizen who was properly registered was challenged and not allowed to vote for the reason that he was living separate and apart from his wife, but this rule did not apply to the Democratic brethren, for a few moments afterwards a Democrat was challenged for the same cause but allowed to vote.

In Piney Grove Township the Democrats did not allow a Populist or Republican judge of election—they were all Democrats—and did the counting as they chose, and superintended the voting, showing the Democratic voter which one of the six boxes to cast his various ballots in, but Republicans and Populists were refused such information, and these six voting boxes were constantly reversed, in order to confuse the voter and get his ballot in the wrong box, which, under the election law, rendered the ballot void and was not counted. In this township more than a dozen men qualified and registered before witnesses, but on the day of election they were not allowed to vote, as their names could not be found on the registration books.

One venerable white man, 66 years old, born and lived all his life in this township, was challenged on the day of election and denied the ballot because there was a variance of two years in his age on the old and new registration books. Another man over 45 years old could not swear to his exact age, but stated that he was about 45 years old, was refused registration. One voter was properly registered, but was challenged and was not allowed to vote because he did not know the governor of the State. Another citizen was asked who the governor of the State was and who the President of the United States was, and not being able to give their respective names was not allowed to vote, when the election law had no such absurd requirements. These questions were not peculiar to this township, but is a fair index to the methods in the other townships and throughout that section of the State.

On the night before the election in this township anonymous letters with skull and crossbones were left on the doorstep of nearly every colored voter in the township, threatening each one with severe punishment and some with death if they went to the polls next day and voted, and many were prevented from voting in this way.

In Little Coharie Township the judges had some tickets put in the wrong box. Some were torn up and not counted. One voter, a Democrat, was allowed to vote without having registered, and another voter, a Populist, was denied registration because he had not listed his poll tax for the past year, when there was no such requirement in the election law for registration. It was practiced by the registrars in nearly every township in the county and largely over the State to ask the voter applying for registration if he had listed his poll tax, and hundreds of voters were not allowed to register on that account.

In Mingo Township a Populist was not allowed to register because he had not listed his taxes for the past year, and immediately upon this ruling of the registrar a Democrat who had not listed his taxes presented himself for registration, and this astute registrar, in order to save his man, thereupon listed the latter's taxes and allowed him to register. It is needless to say that this was without authority of law in either case. This same registrar refused registration to a qualified voter, a white man, because he and his wife were living separate and apart, and on the same day a Democrat who was living in the same infelicitous way was permitted to register. It is needless to say that the election law did not require the registrars to go into the marital relations of a voter or to investigate his domestic infelicities. Yet these absurd questions and those we have enumerated above and many other foolish inquiries were made, not by authority of law, but by the instructions of the election machine in the county and State.

In Newton Grove Township the ballot boxes, six in number, were placed on the head of a barrel and indistinctly labeled in script, when they were required by law to be labeled in bold Roman type. No Populist or Republican was permitted to act as judge of election. The Democrats, in open violation of the election law, took entire control of the election and refused to show the illiterate voter which were the proper boxes in which to deposit his ballot, and to add to his confusion would occasionally change the location of the boxes on the barrel. About 40 votes were lost to the Fusionists in this township by this contrivance alone. And this plan was practiced in nearly every county in the eastern part of the State.

In McDaniels Township a voter registered at the age of 50. He was challenged because he was alleged to be only 49 years old. The voter offered a witness to prove his age, but the witness was not permitted to testify, and this venerable voter was made to retire without voting, whereas the law as to the age of the voter makes only one requirement, and that is that he shall be over 21 years old.

In Clinton Township as many as 40 qualified voters, with ages ranging from 25 to 70 years, were challenged and turned from the polls and not allowed to vote because the election officers claimed their ages were incorrectly stated, and in the same township 46 voters who had properly registered were denied the ballot because on the day of election their names could not be found on the registration books. The registrar had erased these names from his book, or he registered the voter on sheets of paper and refused afterwards to copy the names on the registration books. No Populist or Republican was allowed to act as judge of election, as required by the election law, and in this township one man counted the votes, without calling aloud the names on the tickets as required by law, and the Democratic election official would not permit any voter of any of the other political parties to see the tickets counted, which was plainly permitted by the election law, but with a display of pistols and rifles kept the counting secret and concealed from the view of the public. The Democratic count in this township by the methods I have enumerated was at least 75 votes more than they were entitled to.

In Westbrook Township the Democrats gained 85 votes by this method of counting, and when the opposition insisted upon representation on the counting board they refused, and threatened to abandon the count and not certify to the returns.

And in Herring Township, when the Republicans and Populists insisted upon seeing the count, the registrar and judges of election threw up the boxes, abandoned the count, and refused to certify the returns, and requested the canvassing board to throw out the returns, which it did.

In Dismal Township the registration showed more than 5 to 1 against the Democrats, and one plan the Democrats had to neutralize this vote was to lose the registration books before the day of election, and consequently the registrar left his book at the voting place in the open woods and went about a quarter of a mile for dinner, and remarked while he was away that he hoped some one would steal that book. The book was not stolen, and the next plan was on the day of election to put more Populist tickets in the boxes than there were Populist voters, and this was done; and, when the count was over, 28 more Populist votes were in the boxes than there were Populist voters; but when the Populist voters held the election officers responsible for this fraud, which would have caused the election board to throw out the entire township, these guilty election officials promptly discarded the illegal votes and made the proper returns, and thus their attempted fraud in this instance was frustrated; and yet this Democratic registrar claims to be, and is properly regarded, the most honest registrar among the 16 in Sampson County.

In Halls Township on the night of the election the Populist poll book showed 124 Populist votes, but the Democratic election officials counted in only 96. In this township, as well as in Piney Grove Township, voters were intimidated by finding placards stuck on their front doors on the morning of election day threatening them with awful consequences if they dared to vote any-

thing but the Democratic ticket. This is the township in which a qualified voter was seriously challenged because he had inadvertently plowed one day on his farm without a plowpoint; but there can be seen more justification in this than the registrars in Turkey Township, who refused an old darky registration for the reason that the darky had not completed a certain piece of ditching on his place that he had contracted to do.

Perhaps there was more fraud and corruption in the count and the conduct of the Democratic judges and registrar in North Clinton Township on the night of the election than in any other township in the county, but those facts were given in detail in the article quoted above and need not be repeated here.

The election law under which this election was held was conceived by a wicked genius and is without pretense of fairness, and it is safe to say that no State in the Union, not even Kentucky, was ever forced to hold an election under such a gigantic fraud. But the legislators who framed that bill were but pigmies and beginners in the art compared to the giant manipulators that administered it.

When State Chairman Simmons with his ingenious advisers got together and framed their instructions to the county chairmen, and these county chairmen called together the various township chairmen in secret conference and imparted these secret instructions, then the last hope of the majority of the people in North Carolina for honest elections and manhood suffrage was gone, for this coterie of election prostitutes had finished the plot to carry the State by fraud and force, and the subsequent events of the campaign were but the necessary formalities to complete the farce.

The Democratic candidate for governor of the State, and who now occupies the governor's chair, made the greater part of his campaign over eastern North Carolina followed by a train of ruffians dressed in red shirts and armed with loaded rifles and pistols, who shot into houses on the highways and paraded the streets of the towns when he spoke, to the fear and terror of all law-abiding and peace-loving people. Free speech was stifled and riot and disorder were everywhere. Gray-haired veterans and pious Christian gentlemen who attempted to canvass the State in the interest of honest government and manhood suffrage were not allowed to fulfill their appointments in some parts of the State, but were insulted and driven from the canvass.

Cannons were purchased by Democratic clubs, rifles were secured in large quantities and placed in the hands of Democratic voters, who were directed to use them if necessary to carry out the plan of capturing the State; and in the town of Clinton, the county seat of Sampson, the county in which all the above frauds and crimes were committed, the military armory was invaded without authority of law, save from the company officers, and the rifles taken therefrom, with belts and loaded cartridges, and stored in private houses to use if necessary to carry the county Democratic.

The county did not go Democratic, nor would the State have gone Democratic if the red-shirt and shotgun argument had been eliminated from that disgraceful campaign. But the governor and the entire State officials, together with Chairman Simmons, the United States Senator elect, who are the beneficiaries of that bloody campaign of fraud, force, and theft, are now posing as election reformers and ask that riot and anarchy shall cease and that peace shall reign throughout the land. The people rejoice at this sudden conversion of theirs, but would have more faith in their conversion if they would surrender the stolen goods.

But, Mr. President, they will not surrender the stolen goods. The Senate is not called upon to deal with any of them except the one who will within a few hours be knocking at the door of the Senate for admission, with his stolen credentials stained with fraud, force, blood, and violence. Let the Senate decide to investigate his right to a seat here and all of the facts of that shocking and horrible campaign will be placed before you.

But, Mr. President, the investigation need not stop there, because Mr. Simmons has a record that needs investigating, dating back prior to the campaign to which I have referred. He was at one time nominated by President Cleveland for internal-revenue collector for the eastern district of North Carolina. His confirmation was vigorously opposed and prevented by the late Senator Vance, and much evidence was placed before the Finance Committee of this body to show that he was not a fit man to hold even the position of a revenue officer. As long as Senator Vance lived he prevented the confirmation of this man for collector, and if Vance had continued to live it is safe to say that Mr. Simmons would never have been confirmed. The damaging statement of facts as to this man's unfitness for even that position, which were placed before the Finance Committee, have been abstracted by some unknown agency, and no doubt destroyed. Most, if not all of the same facts, however, can again be produced, and surely if Mr. Simmons was an unfit man to be a revenue officer under the Government he is much less fit to sit in this august body as a representative of a sovereign State which the great Senator Vance so honorably represented.

As throwing some light upon this phase of the matter, I ask to put into the RECORD two letters, one written on August 21 and the other on August 29, by Mr. Charles N. Vance, a son of the late Senator Vance, referring to the facts to which I have just alluded. The letters are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 21, 1900.

MY DEAR SIR: I have received your letter of the 20th instant, in which you ask me to state what were the objections of my father to the confirmation of F. M. Simmons as collector.

Under ordinary circumstances I would not be inclined to revive recollections of political controversies with which my father was concerned, but when impressions, as I understand, are being made in the State that at the time of his death he and Mr. Simmons were on friendly terms, I desire to state that this is not the fact, but on the contrary a short time before my father's death he stated to me that in his opinion Mr. Simmons was not fit for this office, or worthy of the confidence of the people of North Carolina. I know the fact that my father regarded Mr. Simmons as an unscrupulous politician, and for that and other reasons he opposed his confirmation for collector. But for his death Mr. Simmons would never have been collector.

I know of my personal knowledge there were enough Senators at that time with Senator Vance to have defeated Simmons's confirmation.

My father stated to me that if Simmons obtained control of the politics of North Carolina it would be conducted as a machine, regardless of the rights, privileges, or opinions of the people, and if there was anything that my father abhorred in politics it was a machine or bossism. Whatever honors he got came from the people, and he trusted them implicitly.

As expressed in a card which he wrote to the Asheville Citizen in February, 1894, he opposed the confirmation of Mr. Simmons "upon personal as well as public grounds—grounds connected with his unfitness to hold the position to which he had been appointed."

Mr. Simmons stated in a recent card that Senator Vance did not oppose him on account of any charges against his personal character. There were some charges of this kind and some serious objections to him, which were filed at the time with the Finance Committee of the Senate. I have made diligent search for these papers, but failed to find them in the records. They have been abstracted by some one. I do not know by whom or when.

Another reason for Senator Vance's opposition to Mr. Simmons: That gentleman came to Washington early in 1894, and, in his capacity as chairman of the Democratic executive committee of North Carolina, told Mr. Cleveland in an interview he had with him that Senator Vance, who was then fighting the nomination of a certain party as collector in the western district, did not represent the Democratic party of North Carolina or the sentiment of the people in that State at that time. Mr. Simmons denied making this statement, and of course will deny it again, but my father told me he knew he made it, and I believe him in preference to Mr. Simmons. Of course Mr. Simmons will deny this; he denies everything; he can give St. Peter "cards and spades" and beat him denying every day in the week.

Although Mr. Simmons is now posing as having been all along the friend and champion of silver, he joined in 1893-94 with the enemies of Senator Vance, who were trying to encompass his downfall. Simmons was at that time holding up the hands of Mr. Cleveland, who lost no opportunity to injure Senator Vance politically because the Senator refused to support the unconditional repeal of the Sherman Act, but stood up squarely for silver then, as he did until his dying day.

In my opinion Mr. Simmons did not become a friend of silver until he found that the sentiment of the people of North Carolina was overwhelmingly in that direction. When Senator Vance was fighting this battle for silver Mr. Simmons was doing all in his power to uphold the hands of the Administration, which, as is well known by everyone, was in favor of the single gold standard, and was using its patronage in North Carolina to that end.

I regret that Senator Vance's name has been brought into this matter, but, inasmuch as it has, in justice to his memory and in fidelity to his friends, and as an affectionate son, I deny any and all statements made, and by whomsoever, that he ever relented in his opposition to Mr. Simmons's appointment or confirmation as collector, or that he ever entertained for a moment any other than the opinion that from any standpoint Mr. Simmons was wholly unfit for an office of trust.

Of course if the majority of the people of North Carolina desire to send Mr. Simmons to the Senate, I can but acquiesce, but I am determined he shall never get to the Senate upon the false pretense of being the friend of Senator Vance, and I wish to say to those in North Carolina who loved him in life, and who still love and revere his memory, and I believe there are many, that Mr. Simmons was his enemy to his dying day, personally and politically, and was one of the chief of those who tried to humiliate and wound him to his death.

I have written more at length than I had intended, but I wish the people of North Carolina to understand that if my father were living he would not for a moment favor or even countenance the pretensions of Mr. Simmons to Senatorial honors, for I know the fact that if he did not regard him fit to be a revenue collector, he could not have thought him fit to represent a great State in the highest legislative Chamber on the earth.

Yours, very truly,

HON. JOHN R. WEBSTER,
Reidsville, N. C.

CHAS. N. VANCE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 29, 1900.

To the Editor:

Mr. Thomas B. Womack, the former chief clerk of ex-Collector Simmons, in a letter published in the Raleigh Post of the 25th instant, replying to my letter of the 23d instant, in which I stated that Senator Vance thought Mr. Simmons unfit to hold the office of collector, goes on to say: "Why do not these gentlemen give the specific charges against Mr. Simmons's personal character, and give him an opportunity to answer? In his name I demand that they make their charges specific. Why attempt to break down a man's character by insinuating there are charges against him without stating what the nature of the charge is?" He demands that the charges be made specific, and denounces as "cowardly and pusillanimous" that there are charges reflecting on Simmons's personal character without a statement of what they are.

I desire to reiterate, on my own responsibility, the statement which I made in my letter of the 23d instant, that my father opposed the confirmation of Simmons as collector "upon personal as well as public grounds—grounds connected with his unfitness to hold the position for which he had been appointed;" and also to reiterate that he stated to me a short time before his death "that in his opinion Simmons was not fit for this office or worthy of the confidence of the people of North Carolina," and I know that with all Simmons's indorsements he would not have been confirmed but for my father's death. As before stated, I have not been able to find anything on file in the Finance Committee of the Senate, but it seems Mr. Simmons was more for-

unate, and obtained possession of the files which of right should be in the official records of the Senate.

Why did Mr. Simmons wish to withdraw these papers so promptly if there was nothing reflecting on his personal character or fitness for the office of collector? It may be that Mr. Simmons does not recognize either moral or legal responsibility affecting political methods, or acts affecting the political integrity of the State or the Federal Government. But be this as it may, I know that my father did not entertain for Mr. Simmons any confidence whatever, and in vindication of his opinion and estimate of Simmons, and in answer to Mr. Simmons's demand on me in his letter published in the Raleigh Post of the 25th instant, if I knew of any charges against his personal character "that it be made public, to the end that the people may pass upon it," etc., I desire to call the attention of both Mr. Simmons and Mr. Womack to the fact that during the time that Mr. Simmons was collector, and Mr. Womack was his chief clerk or deputy, serious reflections were made upon the character of Simmons by Col. B. B. Bouldin, now of Greensboro, N. C., then revenue agent, a gentleman of high character, and a Democrat, in which Colonel Bouldin, as I am informed by him, charged, among other things, that Simmons falsely certified to compensation paid clerks and deputies, and ignored the claims of a crippled Confederate soldier as gauger, in favor of a man against whom charges of unfitness had been preferred.

I have no doubt Colonel Bouldin will furnish both Mr. Simmons and Mr. Womack with a copy of these charges, if they desire, to the end that Mr. Simmons may "have an opportunity to answer it," or, if preferred by them, would give the charges to the press for the information of the general public, "to the end that the people may pass upon it."

As to the letter signed by a number of citizens of Charlotte, I see but little to answer. They have denied nothing, which I have stated, material to this controversy. I reassert and maintain that Senator Vance never wavered in his opposition to Mr. Simmons's confirmation; but these gentlemen say they believe my father forgave Mr. Simmons at the time of his death. What had Mr. Simmons done that he should need forgiveness? Why should he invoke the charity of a deathbed? I resent and deny Simmons's pretensions of friendship to my father, and say to the people, his friends, that he would not indorse Mr. Simmons's candidacy, if living, nor that of any man who should be driven to the necessity of proving his general character.

I am accused by these gentlemen of bringing up from the grave the hallowed dust of my father and intruding it into this campaign. No, no, gentlemen, such is not the case; but I do insist that Mr. Simmons shall not use the ashes of the noble dead to further his ambition, or as an offering to the people of North Carolina for their support. Simmons was my father's enemy, politically and personally, and I would be recreant to filial duty and lacking in self-respect were I to allow Simmons to pose as his friend in this campaign. If my father's name has been dragged into this matter, it has been done by the friends of Simmons, and since it has been done, I am determined here and now that the people of my State shall know the truth.

We have come upon evil times, in a great State like North Carolina, there is but one man thought fit to be Senator, and that fitness based solely upon grounds of party service. Have not other chairmen been just as efficient as Mr. Simmons, who have never demanded the greatest office within the gift of the people as a reward for their services, or claimed any undue credit for performing their duty? The time has come, in my opinion, when the people should rebuke at the ballot box such pretensions, and they now have that opportunity.

If my father's "ghost" has been called up, as alleged by my Charlotte friends, it was not called up by me, but it has been obtruded in this campaign by the friends of Simmons for whatever influence it might have in his favor, and since it does walk abroad in North Carolina, I hope its silent and impressive influence may be felt in behalf of good government, clean politics, and honest men; and may the example, opinions, and life of him, whom they declare to be "North Carolina's greatest commoner," be worth something to the people of the State, for whose honor, happiness, and glory he gave the best days of his life.

Respectfully, yours,

CHAS. N. VANCE.

These letters speak for themselves. The Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections should not only investigate the credentials of Mr. Simmons to ascertain the facts about the recent campaign in North Carolina, but they should summons before them Mr. Vance, the author of these letters, and the other parties referred to in the letters, and give an opportunity to again collect the evidence which Senator Vance placed before the Finance Committee, and to establish all of the serious charges that he preferred.

Mr. President, the Senate owes it to itself to do this; it owes it to the majority of the voters of North Carolina; it owes it to the whole nation, and to every lover of liberty and of republican institutions.

River and Harbor Bill—Buttermilk Channel.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. FITZGERALD,
OF NEW YORK.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, January 14, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have no desire unnecessarily to lengthen the discussion on this bill. During the debate, however, many members, particularly those with some claim to distinction as humorists, have singled out the provision for the improvement of Buttermilk Channel in New York Harbor for criticism and condemnation. So astounding have been some of the statements made that I deem it proper to place briefly before the committee the facts which

prompted the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to insert in this bill provision for the improvement of this channel.

I do not purpose to indulge in any criticism of the work of the committee. The appropriations carried in the bill are undoubtedly large. For immediate and future expenditure about \$59,000,000 are provided. It must be remembered, however, that this country, with its countless harbors and navigable streams, has a commerce unrivaled in history. Waters that sufficed a few years since for the traffic of the day are now inadequate for the demands of commerce.

New lands and new enterprises are continually adding to the bulk of the country's freight. With the marvelous progress that has been made within recent years in methods of transportation, deeper water and safer channels are required for the vessels now used in the carrying trade. It is idle to waste regrets upon this bill. The people universally demand proper improvements of the waterways upon which the great bulk of our commerce is carried. To secure these improvements they do not begrudge the necessary expenditures, neither will they approve the course of those who seek to prevent the required legislation.

In a bill of such magnitude, with its multitudinous details, with the various and selfish interests at work, it would indeed be miraculous did this bill not contain items properly the subject of criticism. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors, however, as is well known to the members of this House, have devoted much time to this bill. Their labors have been onerous, their industry untiring. If all of the criticisms of the bill have as little to commend them, however, as those made of the item for the improvement of Buttermilk Channel, then the committee can well be content with their work.

It seems remarkable, Mr. Chairman, that gentlemen have so easily been misled about this provision. Merely because a name smacks more of the farm than of an important part of the harbor of New York should not be and, indeed, is not sufficient justification for the attacks that have been made upon the item for the improvement of Buttermilk Channel.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] in his remarks the other day singled out the improvement at Buffalo and the provision for Buttermilk Channel as illustrations of what he considers improper items in this bill. He said:

Permit me to call attention to another item of this bill—an item found on page 10—for what is called the Buttermilk Channel, adjacent to New York City. We all know the vast sums of money that have been appropriated from time to time for improvements in that locality. Until New York Harbor is capable of taking care of the interests of our navigation at that great point I would not object to our appropriating anything that contained a little cream for the people, but when it gets down to buttermilk it seems to me it is time to call a halt.

Now, what is Buttermilk Channel, as it is called in the bill? Mr. Chairman, this improvement is for the benefit of the property holders along the water front of Brooklyn, for the express benefit of their interests, and of no interest to the people at large in this country.

Mr. Chairman, this is merely a sample of the many criticisms made of this project. A little research would surely have prevented such misleading statements. For the benefit of gentlemen unfamiliar with the waters adjacent to New York City, I will state just what Buttermilk Channel is. In the language of Maj. W. L. Marshall, of the United States Engineer Corps, found in a report to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated New York City, June 25, 1900—

Buttermilk Channel is the southeasterly one of two channels connecting the East River with the main channel of New York Harbor. It extends along the Brooklyn water front southwesterly to Red Hook, where it meets the Red Hook Channel, and continues to the main harbor channel. The extreme length of Buttermilk Channel from the 40-foot curve in East River to the 40-foot curve in the main channel is 2½ miles. Throughout this length the channel had a natural depth of about 26 feet at mean low water, but the deep waterway was crooked, in many places narrow, and on account of the rapid current it was difficult to follow. Improvements made under different projects adopted since 1860 have resulted in making the 26-foot channel 1,000 feet wide.

This, Mr. Chairman, is an accurate description of Buttermilk Channel. With Bay Ridge and Red Hook channels it is the most direct and convenient course to the ocean from New York. The improvement of this channel is not merely for the benefit of the adjacent properties. Its improvement is demanded by the necessities of the commerce of the country. This project has been urged by the municipal council of the city of New York, by the New York Cotton Exchange, by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, by the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, by the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, by the New York Produce Exchange, by the Manufacturers' Association of New York, and by the Coffee Exchange of the City of New York.

The resolutions adopted by these various bodies were sent to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Such indorsements could never be secured for an improvement at an expenditure of \$1,800,000, which would be merely "for the benefit of the property holders along the water front of Brooklyn, for the express benefit of their interests, and of no interest to the people at large in this country."

Mr. Chairman, it is unnecessary to enlarge on the standing of

the exchanges and bodies which have indorsed this project. Their memberships represent the great business houses of New York. Nothing but the most meritorious project could command such support.

Two projects for the improvement of New York Harbor were considered by the committee. One—authorized in this bill—the improvement of Buttermilk Channel; the other, the removal of the well-known and dangerous Diamond Reef. The committee determined that at this time it was unadvisable to authorize both of these projects. Careful inquiries were made to ascertain which was the more important and pressing. The selection of Buttermilk Channel for immediate improvement in preference to Diamond Reef indicates in some measure the importance of the project.

Mr. Chairman, I will not detain the committee by reciting at length the reasons that impelled the committee to prefer the Buttermilk Channel project to the project for the improvement of Diamond Reef. This reef has long been a menace to the safe navigation of the waters about New York City. Many vessels have struck it and been seriously injured. Nevertheless competent judges have expressed the opinion that the removal of this reef was not as pressing and as imperative as the improvement of Buttermilk Channel. I have in my hand a copy of a letter sent to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors within a few weeks. It is from Mr. A. Foster Higgins, chairman of the committee on harbor and shipping of the chamber of commerce and president of the pilot commissioners of the port of New York. Certainly he is qualified to speak on this question. Asked to express his opinion "as to the relative importance and necessity to the commerce of this port of two measures, of the work on Diamond Reef and that now asked for and urged on the Government of the still further deepening of Buttermilk Channel," he says:

I do not hesitate to say that the latter should receive immediate attention, even if it necessitates temporary deferring of Diamond Reef work. The latter is a well-known danger, and whilst its removal is demanded, temporary extension of time thereon will not be attended with serious delay. The other, Buttermilk Channel, is now peremptorily demanded.

There seems to be some misapprehension as to the improvements already made in the harbor of New York. It is not a fact, as stated in this discussion, that immense sums of money have been spent for the improvement of the channels of that harbor. The late Mr. Ambrose, in a statement made a few years since before the Senate Committee on Commerce, showed that up to the year 1890 \$296,000,000 had been appropriated for the improvement of rivers and harbors in this country. Of that sum only \$4,047,000 had been expended in New York Harbor. The exports of merchandise from New York during that time had averaged 47 per cent, and the imports 60 per cent of the business of the entire country.

The improvement of the waterways adjacent to New York City is not a local matter. The commercial interests of the country at large demand adequate improvement of these waterways.

This channel, the name of which has occasioned so much hilarity on the part of some gentlemen, is in some respects the most remarkable body of water in this country. Although but 2½ miles in length, the amount and the variety of freight loaded and unloaded upon the wharves along it is marvelous. The wharves along the channel are points for receiving, storing, and shipping grain and South American, Caribbean, Mediterranean, and miscellaneous goods, including sugar, coffee, and cotton. A fairly accurate statement of the freight received has been compiled for the calendar year 1899. No records of the freight shipped are obtainable. In previous years, however, the shipments have exceeded the receipts by an average of about 10 per cent, and the same ratio, for the purpose of illustration, is assumed for the year 1899.

Commercial statistics for the calendar year 1899.

	Tons.	Estimated value.
Receipts.....	5,857,292	\$177,978,512
Shipments (estimated).....	6,444,000	195,776,000
Total	12,301,292	373,754,512

Vessels arriving and departing (1899).

	Number.	Draft.	Tonnage.
Steamers.....	1,246	Feet 18-29	Tons 1,000-6,800
Sail.....	507	12-26	600-3,000
Barges, etc.....	31,380	(*)	(*)
Total.....	33,143		

* No record.

That is to say, Mr. Chairman, 33,143 vessels, during the year 1899, have loaded and unloaded upon the wharves along this channel (2½ miles long) 12,301,292 tons of freight, of the value of \$378,754,512. Moreover, this channel is a natural highway, upon which countless vessels are compelled to pass in going to and from different points in the harbor of New York. It is impossible to make even an approximate estimate of the amount of freight which passes through this channel without touching at the landings.

From the statement of my colleague from New York [Mr. ALEXANDER] made yesterday it appears, however, that for the ten months ending October 31, 1900, the value of New York's exports and imports amounted to \$893,176,394, the greater part of which goes through Buttermilk Channel.

These statistics dispose of the statements made here that these improvements would be exclusively for the benefit of property owners and no benefit whatever to the country at large. It would be useless to deny, of course, that the adjacent properties will not be in some measure benefited. No waterway has ever been improved without resulting benefit to some individuals. The mere fact, however, that some particular individual will benefit more than some other individuals is no reason to defer or to neglect an imperative duty. Buttermilk Channel is a national highway of commerce. Its improvement is in the interest of the trade of the entire country. The individual advantage to be derived from its improvement is insignificant and unworthy of consideration in opposition to the project.

It is necessary to remember, too, that the deepening proposed by this improvement does not extend beyond the harbor lines. These lines have been established by the engineers of the United States Army in charge of such work. Before the expenditure made by the Government in this improvement can be of any benefit whatever to the properties on the Brooklyn shore along which this channel extends it will be necessary for the owners of the several properties to expend at least \$100,000 for dredging.

This channel, extending along the Brooklyn water front until it meets Red Hook Channel, as I have already stated, is part of the most direct route from New York City to the ocean. Unless it is deepened and enlarged, as proposed in this bill, it practically makes useless the expenditures already authorized for the improvement of the Bay Ridge and Red Hook channels.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask whether any portion of these channels is located within the present limits of Greater New York?

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Oh, yes.

Mr. MANN. Is Buttermilk Channel so located?

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I am not opposing the appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. If the gentleman will refer to the Scientific American of January 12 of the present year he will find a small sketch on page 26 showing these different channels carefully marked. In no better way can an accurate idea be had of the different waterways about New York City than by examining this chart.

Mr. MANN. I did not happen to see that.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Many persons complain, Mr. Chairman, that shipbuilders are reaching for the bottom quicker than the dredgers. Many members of this House, more familiar, perhaps, with the "prairie schooner" than with ocean-going freighters, are most clamorous for the reduction of freights; at the same time they seem to be the most strenuous antagonists of appropriations for the deepening of the highways of commerce. Thoughtful men do not expect that the same depths will be required in the internal waterways of the country—the great rivers—as are necessary in the harbors into which come the great vessels of the ocean carrying trade. It is in these vessels that the great surplus of breadstuffs and beef from the interior of the country—from the inland States—as well as the manufactured articles, must be shipped abroad. The farmer and the cattle raiser, as well as the manufacturer, clamor for lower freights.

Experience has shown that large vessels are more economically maintained and operated than smaller vessels and consequently freight charges are reduced by giving facilities for vessels of greater draft. Some gentlemen say, however, that instead of increasing the draft vessels should be built with greater beam. I do not pose, Mr. Chairman, as an authority upon marine architecture. I do know, however, that in building vessels averaging 600 feet in length there is a limit to their beam proportionate to their depth. It can readily be assumed that marine architects in designing vessels try to build them so that they can be utilized as advantageously as possible. The facilities afforded by the harbors recognized as the great commercial ports of the world are matters of knowledge essential to the successful shipbuilder.

It is unquestionably true that the great seaboard cities of this country have not adequate depths of water in their harbors. But recently application was made to a wharfage concern in Brooklyn by a representative of a line of vessels plying between

Liverpool and an Australian port. The vessels of this line are of the most improved style of floating refrigerators. They draw from 34 to 35 feet of water. They have been built expressly for the purpose of carrying eggs, butter, and beef. Yet the request of this line for wharfage facilities in the harbor of New York had to be denied because of the lack of sufficient water. And this is not an extreme case. There is at present building for the White Star Line a steamship which, when fully loaded, will draw 38 feet of water. If such vessels as this are not to be accommodated in the great harbor for which the city of New York is world-famous, where upon our coast can a safe haven be found for them.

Considering the immense traffic in Buttermilk Channel, with the necessity to turn steamers 500 and 600 feet in length, with vessels constantly passing along the channel, 1,200 feet is not an excessive width. The conditions are entirely different on this waterway from the conditions upon the Detroit River, with its width of 300 feet. With the rapid current, the innumerable wharves adjacent to the channel, to which boats are continually coming and going, and with the passing traffic, 1,200 feet of channel is hardly adequate for the increasing demands for facilities upon that highway. No item in this bill is more properly upon a river and harbor bill. Buttermilk Channel is truly a highway of commerce. Its improvement is a national project. The benefits that accrue to a locality from such improvement are lost in the magnitude of the country's interest in the project. Such improvements permanently inure for the benefit of the entire country and to the advancement of its commerce and prosperity. [Applause.]

General Deficiency Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. THETUS W. SIMS,

OF TENNESSEE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 20, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 14236) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIMS said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have heretofore had occasion to make some observations on the rules of this House. As a supplement to said remarks I take the present opportunity to read an article in the Kansas City Times from their regular staff correspondent, Mr. H. J. Groves, appearing in the issue of said paper of February 7, 1901.

NEW ENGLAND INFLUENCE IN AMERICAN POLITICS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 4.

In his great ship-subsidy speech in the Senate Mr. VEST called attention to the domination of New England in American politics. The Senator said:

"New England is rich and powerful. Her people have made money in every contingency and in every era in the history of our country. First they drove back the Indians, took their lands and sold many of their chiefs into slavery in the West Indies. They pursued with great profit the African slave trade, and finally, in a war waged against the people to whom they had sold their negroes after they had found them unprofitable, they had Government contracts which filled every savings bank in New England, until now they are the most powerful and the richest, relatively, of all the sections of this country."

"I am not attacking the people of New England. I admire them; I admire their courage, their sagacity, their aggressiveness. With a sterile soil and an inhospitable climate, they control the politics and the policy of the United States. They send their ablest men to both branches of Congress and keep them here as long as they can preserve the material interests of that section. It makes no difference how much these Representatives and Senators may differ with the people as to matters of sentiment and abstraction, if they are true to the material interests of New England, that is enough. The two Senators from Maine differ as widely as the North and South Poles upon the foreign policy of the United States, but they are both here to-day by the unanimous vote of the legislature of Maine. The two Senators from Massachusetts are equally diverse in their opinion as to the Philippine question and the Philippine war, but the people of Massachusetts send them both here because they know their ability and recognize their usefulness."

"New England is properly named, and I do not say it in any inimical feeling to her people. Old England, a little island up in the fogs and mists of the northern ocean, controls the literature, finance, and commerce of the world. New England, six small States, a majority of them not as large as counties in Missouri, controls the politics of the whole United States. There is no measure before the Senate or the other branch of Congress in which New England does not receive the largest share of the Government bounty."

"Take this bill, Mr. President, and look at its provisions, and you will read between the lines that it is a New England bill."

In these few words Senator VEST told a story known to every student of public men and affairs. The six little States which form the New England group have figured prominently in the settlement of every question that has been presented to the Republic. In a former letter to the Times I called attention to the same conditions Senator VEST discusses. The West and South have sacrificed prestige in Washington by changing the representative every time an ambition was born in the imagination of some bright young lawyer.

The reason these sections have not exerted more influence in national legislation is because they have left but few of their representatives here long enough to ripen into usefulness.

But few men who are sent here leave an impress upon the legislators of the country. Those who do either possess commanding and unusual ability or else secure prestige by continued service and consequent familiarity with the needs of the country.

Of course, if the same rules were used in Congress that prevail in the Missouri legislature, the new man would have a more even chance, but the rules of the House and that grand old humbug called "Senatorial courtesy" in the Senate preclude the new arrival from starring in the first act.

All legislation is directed by one of three influences. In the order named they are effective:

First. The Presidential influence.

Second. The power vested in the Speaker of the House and his pliable and servile Committee on Rules; and

Third. That "modern Senatorial courtesy" that causes the majority side to use all the measures proposed by one of its members.

The first is used extensively. It is the most dangerous. It exists and is effective as the premium for Federal patronage. The second is used to make the first effective.

The third is independent of the other two, and invoked and customary because nearly all the members of the majority side are elected on account of their wealth and interests in, or service to, some trust or corporation, and in turn each needs help to promote private interests.

The new member does not realize before he comes here that he has to go through the "hazing" process before this combination will notice him. He is allowed for a term or two to look wise, if he will be good and keep his mouth shut. Any other course to a new member is suicidal.

He will kindly speak when he is spoken to and come when he is called. Otherwise he is supposed to be a fool and injures his chances for future usefulness. I hope Missouri will continue her policy of keeping her men in the service as long as they are useful. She has a brilliant and growing delegation here now, and before many years have passed their influence will put New England to shame.

Senator VEST is not mistaken about New England. He told the gospel truth, and the West and South should study what he said.

During the last Congress the delegation from Maine controlled the House. In that Congress Maine had four members. This little delegation furnished the Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the chairman of the Committee on Buildings and Grounds.

But Reed resigned, Dingley and Miliken died, and BOUTELLE lost his mind. The result is new men here from Maine. With the exception of LITTLEFIELD, none of them will be heard from during this Congress, but the Pine Tree State will keep them here until they are heard from. They will be continued in Congress until they work, like Reed, Dingley, Miliken, and BOUTELLE did, from the bottom to the top of the committees, and then you will hear from Maine again.

Notwithstanding the fact that Maine lost all her old members in one year and with them three important chairmanships of committees, New England, with 27 members, has six important chairmanships left, while Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska, with 29 members, have only three.

The chairmanships, of course, all go to Republicans, but they go by length of service. Mr. McKinley served fourteen years in Congress, long enough to get to be chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and write the tariff bill which elected him President.

But continuing on Senator VEST's point. Look at New England in the Senate.

These six little States furnish a lesson in that body. President pro tempore FRYE has been in the Senate and House continuously for thirty-two years. Beside being President of the Senate, he is chairman of the following committees: Commerce, Foreign Relations, and Pacific Railroads. Beside these influential plums New England has the following committee chairmanships in the Senate: Agriculture, Finance, Judiciary, Library, Military Affairs, Pensions, Philippines, Privileges and Elections, Relations with Cuba, and on the 4th of March, when Senator THURSTON, of Nebraska, goes out, Senator PLATT of Connecticut succeeds him as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs. Is it any wonder that New England keeps fat on public funds?

In my former letter on the subject I said Iowa had the strongest delegation on the Republican side of the House. There are 11 members in the delegation. Here is the key to their influence. Mr. HENDERSON is Speaker of the House. Mr. HEPBURN is chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Mr. HULL is chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. Mr. LACEY is chairman of the Public Lands Committee, and Mr. COUSINS is at the head of the Committee on Expenditures of the Treasury Department. Each of these has served from eight to twenty-two years in Congress. Long service has won them their places of influence.

The Democrats in the Senate have five chairmanships; of these two go to Missourians—VEST's service to date, twenty-two years; COCKRELL to date, twenty-six years. JONES of Nevada has a chairmanship; he came to the Senate March 4, 1878. MONCAY has one; he came in 1875 and has just been elected for six years more, and CAFFERTY has the fifth one. He has been in the Senate only eight years, but he voted with the Republicans, and this secured him the place.

The people of the West and South should not overlook or pass unnoticed the statement made by Senator GEORGE G. VEST that New England has dominated the politics and legislation of the Republic. Senator VEST does not make statements lightly. He is not given to exaggeration. He is not a word dealer or phrase collier. He means what he says and always has the proof to substantiate his statements. This condition has existed, and every student of public affairs knows it. Senator VEST graphically stated the fact. He casually told the reason. "They keep their men here," was the statement the voters of the Central West should remember. Senator VEST is closing an illustrious career. He is not a candidate for reelection. He can speak without being charged with selfish motives.

In connection with his remark it is well to keep in remembrance the story of one little State alone, the extreme Northeastern State. It has exerted more influence on national legislation and politics than any dozen Western States combined.

I turned to the Congressional record to-day of the Fifty-fifth Congress to see what was the tenure of service of the Maine delegation in that body:

	Years.
Reed's service.....	22
Dingley's service.....	18
Miliken's service.....	16
BOUTELLE's service.....	18
FRYE's service.....	32
HALE's service.....	28
Total.....	134

Average service of delegation, 24 years. The other five New England States follow the same policy, but not to such notable extent. They have

not such a notable record, either. Maine to-day has little influence in the House. One resignation, two deaths, and one case of insanity compelled her to send new men to that body. But FRYE and HALE will see that the "Pine Tree" State gets what she wants in conference committees until the Maine delegation has been here long enough to railroad the State's schemes through the House in proper form. I would not advocate the changing of the Congressional tenure of office. The people should have an opportunity to pass on the Congressional record often, at least every two years, but if the record is a good and growing one, it should be indorsed. There are two districts in the country that for over twenty years have never returned a member for a second term. There are many who give to Congressmen two terms, no more. These districts are never influentially represented in Congress.

The Republican majority in the lower House of Congress is the best trained, finest disciplined, and best organized set of men of years and supposed ability in the world. The Speaker absolutely controls the entire body, but the dictatorship of the Republican side rests in the hands of four men. All of it is centered in the President, from whom they get orders. The four get similar orders, so there is no possibility of disagreement among them. HENDERSON enforces the rules from the chair, while DALZELL, GROSVENOR and PAYNE point out Republican duty from the floor. The rest follow. Now and then a big, brainy Republican like LITTLEFIELD, of Maine, MOODY, of Massachusetts, or HEPBURN, of Iowa, revolts, but the organization is too strong, and the rebel goes back whipped to the reservation. HENDERSON lacks the ability of Reed, but he is a success as Speaker, and with the three lieutenants each commissioned to speak for the President, the boss-ship is not often disputed. Party measure or not, the Republicans always vote together, and vote as the four Administration representatives order. They follow the programme.

Thus you have the story of influence in Congress. It is the story of long service. Missouri, the great central State in the Union, should study the story to profit.

H. J. GROVES.

The Late Senator Gear.

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. RICHARDSON,

OF TENNESSEE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, January 26, 1901.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That it is with deep regret and profound sorrow that the House of Representatives hears the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN HENRY GEAR, late a Senator from the State of Iowa."

"Resolved, That the House extends to his family and to the people of the State of Iowa sincere condolence in their bereavement."

"Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the House be now suspended to enable his associates to pay fitting tribute to his high character and distinguished services."

"Resolved, That the Clerk transmit to the family of the deceased and to the governor of the State of Iowa a copy of these resolutions with the action of the House thereon."

"Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate."

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret that I did not have notice earlier that I might have had time to prepare with some care remarks appropriate to this occasion. It was only a few moments ago that I determined to say a word by way of eulogy of Senator GEAR. I remember, Mr. Speaker, very well when Senator GEAR became a member of this House in the Fiftieth Congress, the session after I became a member. I was not thrown intimately in connection with him during his legislative career, but I came to know him very well. Senator GEAR came into national politics as a member of Congress late in life.

My experience has been, sir, that it is rather unusual for a man to enter this House so old as was Senator GEAR when he came here and make so perfect a success as a legislator as is true of that gentleman. He was past 60 years of age when he entered Congress. As remarked by the gentleman from Ohio who preceded me, he at a very early date became a member of the greatest legislative committee of the House of Representatives—the most important of any of its committees. We who were members at that time will all bear witness to his faithfulness and his capacity as a member of that important committee in the Fifty-first Congress.

I am reluctant to refer to myself on any occasion of this kind, but I remember very well his participation in the debate when the tariff question was being debated in the Fifty-third Congress. Gentlemen have spoken of the tenderness and loving nature and disposition of Governor GEAR. This was clearly shown in the Fifty-third Congress. I am sure no gentleman was better entitled to be held in the deep affection that seemed to cluster around him. It was illustrated in the case to which I am about to refer by a gentleman who was a candidate against him for the Senatorship in Iowa. That gentleman was then and is now a member of this House and is now doing me the honor to listen to what I am saying.

I remember very well when, as the result of the contest there for the Senate, Senator GEAR was successful, of having a conversation with this gentleman, his colleague, who was then aspiring to the exalted station which Governor GEAR had won. He said he had a first-rate chance to win the fight, indeed he believed he

would win until Governor GEAR became a candidate and entered the field actively. He said: "After the old man came into the race I knew I had no chance." He added that when it became known he wanted the Senatorship all opposition quickly vanished. He spoke of him in the most kindly and tender way, which satisfied me of the depth and strength of the affection which Governor GEAR must have had on the people of Iowa.

I have already hinted at and was about to mention an incident which occurred and came under my own observation when he returned to the House of Representatives as a Senator-elect. He had been away some time seeking the position. I mention this incident to show the feeling and the respect entertained for Governor GEAR, not only by his colleagues on the Republican side, but by gentlemen on this side of the House at that time. After an absence of several weeks spent in conducting his campaign he returned. The tariff bill of the Fifty-third Congress was being discussed. I had the honor to be in the chair in Committee of the Whole when the Senator-elect came upon the floor and took his seat just in the rear of that side. He had been here only a few moments when some question on which he desired to speak was presented. He rose and addressed the Chair for recognition, which was promptly accorded him.

Up to that moment his presence on the floor had not been noticed. I took the liberty, because of the warm friendship which I entertained for him, to recognize him, when he addressed the Chair, as "The Senator from Iowa," which at once called attention to his presence. The applause which broke out on that side of the House was not surpassed by that which followed upon this side, in recognition of his popularity and the high esteem in which he was held.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not occupy further time in speaking of this distinguished man. I regret that there are not more "Governor Gears" in the politics of this country. Iowa has sent many able, accomplished, and faithful legislators to this body and to the other branch of Congress; but in my judgment she has never sent any man better calculated to reflect honor upon a great Commonwealth, for faithfulness to duty, for ability, for integrity of character, and for sincerity in all his public acts, than JOHN H. GEAR.

Naval Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. SYDNEY E. MUDD,

OF MARYLAND,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, February 25, 1901.

The House having under consideration the conference report on the bill (H. R. 13706) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes—

Mr. MUDD said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire merely to occupy the time of the House long enough to place myself on record as one of the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs in favor of a liberal and progressive policy in the upbuilding of our Navy. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, just how many ships Germany is building, or Japan is building, or any foreign country is building, but I do know that if we are to build up a Navy in the United States we can not do it by this process of continued investigation and delay. The way to build up a navy is to appropriate the money and authorize contracts to enter upon the work of construction. It is not to wait, to wait, and to investigate. I am in favor, sir, of such a policy as will not only keep our Navy up to the rank where it is to-day—the fourth among the nations of the world—but I favor a more aggressive and, if need be, more expensive policy of going ahead with the work which we have begun, and uplift it until it shall rank first among the nations of the world.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] stated in answer to a question of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. DAYTON] that it was in pursuance of the investigation that had been had that we have to-day the best armor plate in the world; and yet the gentleman from Illinois—and that is the policy of those who agree with him—would want us to wait a year or two more before going into the building of further battle ships, until we get an armor plate that must be better than that which he has just now designated as the best in the world.

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. MUDD. Yes.

Mr. HOPKINS. Is it not a fact that when this debate commenced in this House a number of Congresses ago on the harveyized plate the Krupp process was unknown, and is it not admitted by all scientists and experts and all men that are intelligent upon

this subject that the Krupp process is infinitely superior to the harveyized plate?

Mr. MUDD. I admit that. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, by his response to the gentleman from West Virginia to which I have just referred, and by the remark now made by him, demonstrates the fact that we are now building our battle ships and armored cruisers from the standpoint of the highest development in naval construction which the world has at this day. The gentleman has attempted some analogy from the building of houses. We build our houses, or we undertake to build them, from the standpoint of the highest intelligence and learning that we have among architects and builders at the time of their construction. It is upon just this basis that we must proceed now to build battle ships and armored cruisers. We can not build anything by delaying for the purpose of building upon a knowledge of facts which we can only know in the future.

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the gentleman allow me again?

Mr. MUDD. Yes.

Mr. HOPKINS. Is it not a fact that there is a dispute in the Ordnance Department of the Navy to-day as to whether cruisers should be sheathed or unsheathed?

Mr. MUDD. Yes.

Mr. HOPKINS. Is it not the part of wisdom to have Congress wait until the question can be determined as to which is the correct process, before we authorize any more cruisers?

Mr. MUDD. No, I do not admit that. Mr. Speaker, if we shall wait until we in this Congress know everything, we shall never do anything in shipbuilding or in any other line of progress.

Mr. DAYTON. And will the gentleman allow me to suggest that if we had waited for the settlement of this dispute we should not have to-day a single armored cruiser afloat?

Mr. MUDD. And we shall never do anything more in pushing forward the rank of our Navy if we pursue the policy advocated by the gentleman from Illinois, which is to wait, and to wait, until we know all of that of which we know nothing to-day.

Mr. HOPKINS. The Senate amendment only postpones this until December next, and during the interim it provides that the information shall be furnished to Congress on this disputed subject, so that we can determine which is the best type of cruiser to authorize, and then go on with the construction of our Navy. But from my standpoint it would be worse than foolishness to authorize the construction of two of these cruisers costing millions of dollars, if after they are constructed we are to find them absolutely worthless or practically so as a part of the great Navy we seek to build up.

Mr. MUDD. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that statement may sound well enough standing alone, but if we are to wait until next December, other doubts will by that time have arisen as to some of the details of the construction of these ships, and if we are to wait until all doubts shall have been resolved into absolute certainty and perfect knowledge, then, I repeat, we shall never build up the Navy or do anything else in the way of national progress in this country.

Mr. Speaker, all of us know, as the gentleman from Illinois has stated, that there is to some degree a controversy as to whether sheathed or unsheathed battle ships and cruisers are better. We can build them both for that matter. The majority of the Board of Construction at the Navy Department are of the opinion that for the present the safer plan is that all vessels of the type recommended in this bill be not sheathed and coppered. I understand that the question as to the necessity of sheathing, and the value of it, depends in large measure upon the question of the climate into which such vessels are to go. In tropical climates I believe it is contended that the bottoms of vessels foul more readily than in milder climates, and it is contended that there is a greater necessity for sheathing and coppering. Vessels of both types are in existence now, however. Vessels of both types are in existence in the navies of the larger nations of the world, and both do excellent service.

The gentleman from Illinois seems to rest upon the impression that a very large and vital factor of the value of a vessel depends upon the question whether or not it is sheathed or unsheathed. That is not the case, Mr. Speaker. We are now building, I say again, from the standpoint of the highest knowledge and the highest development of naval science that the world knows to-day. We shall have to depend upon that condition and that degree of advancement of knowledge for all of the years of the future. We have to-day what all men admit is the best armor plate that is manufactured in the world. We have facilities for shipbuilding and for manufacturing of all the factors that enter into the construction of ships that no nation in the world possesses.

In the midst of the pressing onward of the great nations of the world, and great rivalry for mastery upon the seas, it is no time for gentlemen to stand here now and prate to us the hackneyed precepts and principles of economy. We did not win our recent battles and add to our domain by a blind adherence to what gentlemen here call economy.

Everybody admits that new conditions, arising from our recent acquisition of territory, render a larger and a greater Navy an imperative necessity for this country. Whether or not we did a wise thing in adopting this policy of territorial acquisition is not now before the House. Our territory has enlarged; we have expanded. We have acquired possessions extending far away into the distant seas, and we shall hold on to them. They render absolutely necessary a larger Navy for the defense and for the maintenance of the prestige and the pride of the country. It is through our Navy and through the strides that we have been making toward the upbuilding of it that we have enforced respect for our country and for our name throughout the world, and that we have given an impetus to trade development that has brought to an unexampled level the commercial standing and prestige of the country.

I trust the House proposition may be adhered to, and that in all the years that are to come we may go ahead in building battle ships and building armored cruisers, building the highest type of naval war vessels that we may possess the knowledge, as I know that we do and shall always possess the means to build.

Centennial of the Louisiana Purchase.

SPEECH

OF

HON. ADOLPH MEYER,

OF LOUISIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 1, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 9829) to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory by the United States by holding an international exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, mine, forest, and sea in the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am cordially in sympathy with the pending bill (H. R. 9829) reported by the Special Committee on the Centennial of the Louisiana Purchase.

In the "making" of this grand Republic of the Western Continent and the world certain great events stand out prominently as formative in their character and the basis of its present grandeur and yet greater destiny. I would select as the most important, and those in which all Americans can take a just pride, the following acts of the drama: The settlement of Virginia, Massachusetts, and the other colonies on the Atlantic seaboard; the union of these colonies in the movement for independence and its successful accomplishment in 1783; the formation of the Federal Constitution in 1787 and the inauguration of the Government created; and, lastly, the acquisition of the Territory or Province of Louisiana from France by treaty in 1803.

The Union has been involved in wars more or less important to its interests or honor, but even when the whole country supported these wars with its blood and treasure the occasion was much less important. The war with Great Britain in 1812-1815 was honorable to our arms, and the successful defense of Louisiana will always be an imperishable glory in our annals; but a treaty of peace with England had been concluded prior to that event, and while that treaty neither gained nor sacrificed American territory it failed to secure the special object which induced us to take up arms. The war with Mexico led to large acquisitions of territory, but they were greatly inferior in area and resources to the Louisiana purchase.

IMPORTANCE OF THE ACQUISITION OF LOUISIANA.

The acquisition of Louisiana eclipses all our territorial acquisitions. It secured us, beyond all dispute and forever, the free navigation of that mighty river justly termed the Father of Waters, which, with its tributaries, bears to the sea the products and wealth of a valley second to none on the globe for fertility, climate, commercial facilities, and resources. Few persons have an idea of the extent of the waters and tributaries. Speaking of the river from Cairo to the Gulf, one of my predecessors in this House stated that the distance was 1,170 miles by the river, into which 43 other rivers, navigable by steamboats for 16,000 miles and by bateaus and flatboats for 50,000 miles, poured their waters. He estimated its commerce as double that of the whole foreign commerce of the country and as needing no navy to defend it.

According to the United States Statistical Abstract for 1890, the area of the Union in 1800, comprising only the territory between the Atlantic Ocean and the Mississippi River, represented only 827,844 square miles. The Louisiana purchase increased our area to 1,990,775 square miles, or more than double the original area. By this acquisition we added 1,162,931 square miles to the public domain. In acquiring Florida we added 59,268 square miles. The Texas annexation of 1845 gave us 274,366 square miles. By the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo we acquired from Mexico some 522,-

568 square miles, including California and New Mexico. The Gadsden purchase embraced 45,535 square miles. The Alaska purchase added 577,390 square miles, but it was mostly of territory which is not adapted for settlement. [Applause.]

There is not one of these acquisitions which compares for a moment with the Louisiana purchase. Even the grand and fertile State of Texas—truly an empire State—falls far behind in area, variety of resources, and products to this grand, imperial purchase of Louisiana. It must be remembered, too, that the purchase of Louisiana led to the settlements and the political movements which culminated in the separation of Texas from Mexico, the establishment of its independence, and its final annexation to the American Union. The same may be said in respect to the acquisition of California. Had the Louisiana territory continued as it once was, and as Napoleon desired it to become and remain, a strong and flourishing French colony, the acquisition of California and our whole Western extension would have been relegated to a distant future and accomplished only after a bloody and costly war. We would have had Canada for our northern border, protected by the armies and navy of Great Britain, Louisiana held, developed, and fortified by France, blocking and impeding our progress westward and also our commerce to the Gulf, and perhaps Spain holding Florida, or, worse still, ceding it to England or France as a thorn in our side.

DUE TO THE GENIUS OF JEFFERSON.

From all this danger and peril we were saved by a fortunate conjunction of circumstances and the genius of one of the greatest of mankind—a statesman who knew as much of the philosophy of government as the wisest of men, but who to the comprehension of great principles united a quickness of perception and a vigor of execution that was not excelled by Cromwell or Jackson. His comprehension of a political situation was perfect. Never was it more signally exhibited than on this occasion.

Early in the year 1803 authentic intelligence of the cession of Louisiana and the Floridas by Spain to France reached the United States. No information could have been more distasteful than this to the Government and people of the United States. Spain was deemed a weak power. Her tenure of Louisiana created no special alarm. There was no fear that the States of the West lying in the Mississippi Valley would not be able to command in the end a free transit for their products to the sea. Spain's power, if it should become necessary to do so, could be dislodged. It was far different with France.

Here was one of the greatest of the European powers, with a fleet largely superior to ours, a great and brave army, a local population not unfriendly but devoted to France, and a great ruler with vast designs, resources, and the audacity of genius. There was the greatest possible danger that Napoleon would colonize, develop, and fortify the country. He would then be master of the situation. Our commerce would be at his mercy and our progress westward arrested. It was a deathblow to all our schemes and fondest hopes. Had Mr. Jefferson been a man of hasty temper, violent passions, or contracted views, or had he listened to the clamor of public feeling, or to the pressure of his political enemies, he would have pursued a course leading us up to war. Had he drawn the sword, very probably the country would have sustained him, and perhaps also he might have overrun Louisiana with our armies.

But he was far too wise to allow his hand to be forced. Fortunately he and his party friends had ever been friendly to the French people. He had been long time a minister to France and had formed valuable friendships. He had deprecated the policy which was once eager to exchange the friendship of our old ally in the Revolutionary struggle for one of alienation, hatred, and war. Yet he had favored neutrality in the fierce struggle then going on in Europe as strongly as had Washington himself. It was in this moderate, cautious temper and spirit that the instructions to our minister in France, Mr. Livingston, were framed.

JEFFERSON'S DIPLOMACY.

All this was well enough and avoided the principal danger; but Mr. Jefferson had a stronger card to play, and he knew how and when to do it. France and Great Britain had been at war from 1793 up to the 27th of March, 1802, when the treaty of Amiens was signed. But the terms of the treaty were not carried out by England, and the temper of the two nations remained hostile and embittered. Each Government distrusted the other; it was rather an armed truce than a real peace. War was not merely liable, but likely, to break out afresh, as it did finally on the 18th of May, 1803. A real peace was not in sight. It was in this unsettled condition of affairs, which Mr. Jefferson fully appreciated, that he wrote a personal letter to Mr. Livingston, the American minister to France, on the 18th of April, 1802.

The letter was not addressed officially to the French Government, but it was written so that Mr. Livingston could exhibit it or quote from it or use its form of thought in conversation with the foreign office or with the Emperor himself. He stated strongly but temperately the great injury to the United States by this transfer of Louisiana to France, and the manner in which our

country viewed the proceeding, and in the plainest possible terms that, if war should break out anew between France and England, an alliance by our Government with Great Britain, in order to abrogate her possession of Louisiana, would inevitably follow. He spoke as a friend of France, as a President of a country deeply anxious for the friendship of that nation, but with a frankness and point never exceeded in the intercourse of nations.

The document was unofficial. It was a sort of private talk, but talk that Bonaparte could not fail to understand. To make sure that its substance would reach the French ruler and to leave no possible doubt as to the policy of the President the letter was sent open to M. de Nemours, who was then about to return to France, the letter to be read, then sealed and forwarded to its destination. Mr. Jefferson told him that his object in giving it to him in that way was to enable him to impress on the Government of France the inevitable consequences of their taking possession of Louisiana.

In all human probability it was the suggestions of this letter that finally operated on the mind of Napoleon at the time when, war with Great Britain breaking out afresh, he concluded to make a virtue of necessity, sell Louisiana to the United States for some \$12,000,000, and thus avoid forcing the United States into a British alliance. That he acted wisely and for the best interests of France as well as the United States is clear. If anything could add to the just fame of Jefferson in this great transaction, it is his selection of James Monroe—a man of great force of character and his close personal friend—as a special envoy with ample powers to act, in connection with Livingston, and the letter he wrote him on the occasion. Well did he say in that letter: "On the event of this mission depends the future destinies of this Republic." [Applause.]

It was on the 30th of April, 1803, that the treaties were signed by which the entire province of Louisiana was ceded to the United States. No such momentous acquisition of territory has ever been made by peaceful methods and without injury or wrong to a single human being.

MOVEMENT FOR CELEBRATION OF CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY.

It was natural that as years rolled round and the centennial anniversary of this event approached there should be among the citizens residing in this old territory of Louisiana a movement looking to its fitting celebration. A convention was held for this object on January 10, 1899, in St. Louis, Mo. Fifteen States and two Territories were represented, and it was resolved to hold an international exposition during the centennial year of the purchase.

The city of St. Louis was invited to undertake the enterprise. Assuming that the most fitting celebration of this great event of the acquisition of Louisiana would be an exhibition or exposition of the progress of this section in arts, industry, and civilization, it would follow that there are strong reasons why the city of St. Louis should be taken as the place for this special form of celebration. Its large population, its central position, railroad and water connections, and the wealth, energy, and intelligence of its citizens give it special fitness for this mode of celebration. In addition to this, the Government, by the law of June 6, 1900, is formally and distinctly committed to this project, and has pledged itself to advance \$5,000,000 in aid so soon as the city of St. Louis should raise \$10,000,000 to defray the expense of the exhibition.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in a letter to the Hon. Mr. TAWNEY, dated February 6, 1901, states that satisfactory evidence has been submitted to him that the \$10,000,000 has been raised by the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company by satisfactory pledges from responsible parties for over five millions and five millions more by a valid ordinance of the city of St. Louis. The people of this city, therefore, having complied with the condition prescribed by Congress, it would seem that the Congress is fully committed to the appropriation contained in this bill.

The Special Committee on the Centennial of the Louisiana Purchase have given most thoughtful attention to this subject, and their very able report leaves little to be said on the general subject. They have drawn their bill with much care. The two gentlemen on the minority of the committee, who were constrained by their honest convictions to oppose the connection of the Federal Government with these expositions, concede, in their report, that there are abundant precedents for the bill and that almost identical legislation was enacted and money appropriated for expositions held at Philadelphia, at New Orleans, at Atlanta, at Chicago, and at Buffalo. They also recognize the grandeur and importance of the event to be commemorated, and, what is very important, they consider that the Government's interests are carefully guarded in the bill prepared. Such an indorsement ought to weigh with all of us, and certainly does with my mind.

THIS HISTORICAL INCIDENT SHOULD BE CELEBRATED AT NEW ORLEANS.

Without objecting, therefore, in any degree to the bill of the committee as drawn, and with a very high appreciation of their work and labors, I must call your attention to the fact that an industrial exposition, especially one of a national and international

character, while it may illustrate the grand and beneficent consequences of this act of purchase, is not fairly and distinctly a celebration of the historical incident, the historical event. For example: When you celebrated the centennial of the Declaration of Independence you celebrated it not at New York or Washington City, but at Philadelphia, where the Declaration was penned and published to the world. A proposition to hold it elsewhere would not have been entertained.

The formation of the Federal Constitution—where will you celebrate it save in the city where it was framed and agreed on? The inauguration of the Federal Government—our first Administration of Washington—you held it in New York, where it happened. The centennial of the victory of Yorktown, which in effect ended our long struggle for independence—how absurd to have celebrated it at Richmond, or Baltimore, or New York, or any other place than the very field, the identical spot, where the American and French forces led by Washington compelled the surrender of Cornwallis? You would not celebrate the landing of the pilgrims at New Haven, at Providence, or even at Boston, but exactly where it occurred. The first settlement of the Old Dominion—the earliest of all our colonies—would you celebrate it at Richmond or at Jamestown? These questions supply their own answers.

I hold, therefore, and maintain that in addition to this grand proposed exposition, national and international, to be held at St. Louis, which has already been determined upon, and as I believe most wisely, that there should be also a special historical celebration of the actual transfer of this vast province of Louisiana at the very spot where the transfer of sovereignty from the civil and military authorities of France to those of the United States actually occurred. That was in the city of New Orleans, the capital city of Louisiana—the entire province. The historian of the Tenth Census of the United States tells you the story in brief words, as follows:

On the 18th of May, 1803, Casa Calvo, sent from Habana for the purpose, jointly with Governor Salcedo, proclaimed the coming surrender and its contemplated terms, and they held themselves in readiness for the hourly expected arrival of General Victor. Instead of him came a rumor, painful to Laussat and incredible to the creoles, who had so lately received the news of the cession to France with the liveliest delight, and about the last of July, 1803, a vessel from Bordeaux brought the official announcement that on the 30th of the preceding April Louisiana had been purchased by the United States.

On the 31st of October Congress authorized the President to take possession of the ceded territory. On the 30th of November, with troops drawn up in line on the Place d'Armes and with discharges of artillery, Salcedo, in the hall of the Cabildo, delivered to Laussat the keys of New Orleans, and Casa Calvo declared the people of Louisiana absolved from their allegiance to the King of Spain. From a flagstaff in the square the Spanish colors descended, the French took their place, and the domination of Spain in Louisiana was at an end.

On Monday, the 20th of December, 1803, with similar ceremonies Laussat turned the province and the keys of its port over to Commissioners Claiborne and Wilkinson. The French tricolor, which had floated over the Place d'Armes for the short space of twenty days, gave place to the Stars and Stripes, and New Orleans was an American town.

THE CAPITAL OF THE GREAT PROVINCE OF LOUISIANA.

Here was the capital of this vast Province of Louisiana. Here and in the immediate vicinity was the great bulk of the population of the province, and here was its seat of commerce. In 1803 the population of New Orleans was 10,000 souls. The city was already an important seaport. Some 265 loaded vessels sailed in 1802 from the harbor, with a tonnage of 31,241. The increase of tonnage in 1803 was 37 per cent. The exports were \$2,000,000, and the imports were two and a half millions.

Of the province of Louisiana, outside of the present State boundary, little was even known. The savage tribes roamed unmolested over that vast domain—hunted, fished, fought, lived, and died. Here and there were small settlements. On the day that France made formal delivery of the province St. Louis and the adjacent districts had a population of less than 3,000.

Even in the year 1810, some seven years after the country had been thrown open to American settlement under the American flag, the population of St. Louis was less than 1,500. St. Louis was first established as a trading post in February, 1764, and the progress of the town or city for a long time was exceedingly slow. The real, magnificent growth of St. Louis has been only in the past fifty or sixty years. That it will be one of the greatest of our American cities no man can doubt—perhaps the greatest, as the seat of a great manufacturing industry, for which it has marked advantages—but at this time (1803) the place was insignificant.

The present city of New Orleans was founded in 1720 and was made the capital of the province of Louisiana by Governor Bienville in 1723, over forty years before the establishment of the trading post at St. Louis, which some years hence will welcome the industries of the civilized world to its portals and generous hospitality. [Applause.]

It seems to me, therefore, that in addition to your grand and costly exposition of industry at St. Louis it is eminently a fitting duty for us to celebrate in some appropriate manner the historical event—the actual realization of the great and noble dream of Jefferson and the patriots of that day, the formal transfer of the province, the raising of the American flag where that of France

and Spain had so long floated, as a token that henceforth the power of the new Republic of the west, its commerce and industry, were to be paramount in that grand outlet of the States of the Mississippi Valley.

The amount of money necessary for such a historical celebration would be trifling in comparison with what you propose to expend in aid of the noble St. Louis project. I suggest this in the interest of the coming celebration—to give it completeness, finality, and dignity. To attempt to celebrate this great and interesting historical transfer of sovereignty in any distant city would be illogical, inappropriate, and grotesque. The history of Louisiana—it is written and will stand. It is full of interest, romance, adventure, heroism, suffering, and dignity. You can not blot it out, even if you desired to do so. You can not obscure it.

The story of this grand tradition of a mighty province to our dominion as a people; the rescue of the soil from the floods and its consecration to the purposes of industry and commerce; the victory of New Orleans in 1815; the valor of the sons of Louisiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, and the West; the fame of Jackson—these events and many more that live in story and song and can not perish from our thoughts all admonish you to render this simple, natural act of justice. [Applause.]

The General Deficiency Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY D. ALLEN,

OF KENTUCKY,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 21, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 14236) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While considering the appropriation bill now before the House, I desire to call the attention of members and the country to the bill pending in the Senate known as the ship-subsidy bill, which provides for a bounty or gift by the Government of \$9,000,000 a year for twenty years, or \$180,000,000, to the shipowners and shipbuilders of this country. I shall not go into the details of the provisions of the bill or of its operation.

It is claimed by the authors and advocates of the bill that its passage is necessary to the upbuilding of the long-decayed shipping industries of the United States, but the real purpose of it is to provide a sufficient fund in the way of bounty to give to the shipowner the extra cost of building the vessel, and the maintenance and operation of it. Their reason is in effect that because the material man gets more for his goods, and the seaman more for his wages than do the foreign merchant and seaman, all of which the Republican party claims to be due to its policy of legislation in the way of protection, these amounts must be paid back by the Government out of the taxes paid by the people. But when we come to scrutinize the bill we find it so constructed that all seamen and sailors may consist of the very class of cheap foreign seamen and sailors who, they say, are such great obstruction to the prosperity of the American shipping industry.

Mr. Chairman, there is no more reason, authority, or justification for subsidizing the shipping industry than for the building up and supporting by Government aid of any other industry. If we are to subsidize this class of industry, why not apply the same principle to every other industry? The Republican party is responsible for the present condition of our shipping interests. When that party came into power in 1860 our flag floated over every Atlantic steamship, but by the end of the year 1867 no steamer crossing the Atlantic Ocean carried the American flag. For more than forty years the Republican party has controlled our national policy toward the shipping interests, with the result that confronts us in that industry to-day.

In that time they have passed two subsidy bills for the revival of shipping, both of which have proven absolute failures, and to-day we see but 9 per cent of our enormous foreign commerce carried in American ships. But, Mr. Chairman, our condition is not so bad for the country at large as the promoters of this scheme would have us believe. I find from investigation, and upon valid authority, that the tonnage of the steam vessels of the United States has been rapidly increasing of late years and is now the greatest in the history of our country. I will quote Republican authority for the statement. In his speech at the Chicago Commercial Club banquet on October 10, 1899, President McKinley said:

Our shipbuilding has been greatly increased. For the first time in all our history the tonnage of our steam vessels exceeded on June 1 the tonnage of all our sailing vessels, barges, and other craft. We built in 1897 and 1898 more vessels of iron and steel than of all other materials combined. Our tonnage

increased during the year 100,000 tons, and is without a parallel in our recent history. More large ocean steamships are under construction in the United States than ever before. Our shipbuilding plants are being enlarged and new establishments planned.

The increase of the commerce of the United States has been marvelous in the last ten years. In 1890 our imports were \$823,397,726 and in 1900 were \$829,053,116, being an increase of scarcely 1 per cent. In 1890 our exports were \$857,503,548 and in 1900 were \$1,478,050,854, being an increase in ten years of 72.4 per cent. The excess of exports over imports in 1890 was \$5,654,390, while in 1900 the excess was \$648,998,738.

Our imports from Europe in the ten years from 1890 to 1900 were reduced from \$474,000,000 to \$439,000,000. And our exports to Europe in that time were increased from \$682,000,000 to \$1,111,000,000. Our imports from North America in 1890 were \$151,000,000 and in 1900 were \$131,000,000. During that time our exports to North America increased from \$95,000,000 to \$202,000,000. Our imports from South America increased from \$101,000,000 in 1890 to \$102,000,000 in 1900, while our exports to that country increased from \$35,000,000 to \$41,000,000. Importations from Oceania in 1890 were \$23,000,000 and in 1900 were about the same, while our exports to that country increased during that time from \$17,000,000 in 1890 to \$40,000,000 in 1900. Our imports from Africa increased \$6,000,000, while our exports to Africa increased \$17,500,000.

Last year the import trade of the United States shows an increase of \$30,000,000 over the previous year, while the export trade shows an increase of more than \$202,480,000 over the previous year. Our trade with Austria has more than doubled in the last ten years, and we now send to that country six times as much as Germany, our trade being next to that of Great Britain. So that, Mr. Chairman, with these rapid strides in our foreign commerce, it is difficult to see the reason for subsidizing the shipping interests for promoting that commerce.

With these figures before us there is no foundation for the claim of the subsidist. The products of this country will find the markets of the world, subsidy or no subsidy, and no contribution of the Government to this industry is demanded or can be defended. The whole scheme of this subsidy, if passed, will be a surrender by the Government upon the hold-up of the shipowners and shipbuilders of this country, inspired, encouraged, and backed up by the aid of MARCUS HANNA.

Instead of the bill compelling more American sailors at better wages, the shipowner may pocket the subsidy and hire foreign seamen at the lowest wages. Instead of assuring larger American cargoes, it makes it possible for shipowners to sail with empty vessels and still secure the subsidy. Instead of securing faster ships for the trade, it makes fast trips of no consequence. Instead of providing for more mails and fast mails, it leaves foreign mails to be carried by British and German ships.

Instead of securing to commerce more ships, it puts it in the power and to the interest of existing companies to combine and wipe out foreign competition, divide the subsidy among as few ships and shipowners as possible, and provide large bounties to be added to the dividends of steamship companies already receiving good profits without the aid of subsidies. This fact can not be doubted when it is known that those behind this raid are the Standard Oil trust and associates, the combine that has destroyed competition in the transportation of the industries of the United States by means of enormous discrimination.

If this bill should become a law, it will place it in the power of the steamship trust to control absolutely the transportation rates of our exports, and to raise the charges only to the limit of its greed. In the exercise of this power will result enormous damage to the agricultural interests of this country.

The farmers, whose products amount to 65 per cent of our foreign exports, will be compelled to submit to and bear the might of this burden. The price in the foreign market of our large surplus of farm products, less the cost of transportation, is the price in our home market, so that the increase in ocean freight rates to that extent decreases the price to the farmer.

Mr. David Lubin, in an article contributed to the New York Evening Post of December 17, 1900, presents the operation of the subsidy grant with regard to the agricultural interests in a very plain and lucid manner. He says:

AN INJURY TO AGRICULTURE—THE SHIPPING SUBSIDY BILL IN ITS EFFECT ON FREIGHT—CHARGES FOR FARM PRODUCTS.

To the Editor of the Evening Post:

SIR: The advocates of the shipping subsidy bill make the following claims: 1. That it is intended to protect American shipping against the competition of foreign ships.

(2) That this protection is intended to diminish and eliminate the employment of foreign ships in our foreign carrying trade and to give this trade to American ships.

(3) That thus will be built up a great American merchant marine.

(4) That all this will be of service to this nation by keeping at home large sums now paid to foreign ships; by the employment of American capital and labor in the building and manning of American ships; by supplementing the strength of the Navy in the training of American seamen and in the use of the merchant ships in time of war.

Setting aside all other arguments for the time being, it is the purpose of this letter to limit the discussion to the influence which the operation of this bill is likely to have on agriculture.

Among the principal factors which operate to advance or reduce the prices

of agricultural staples there is none more potent than the price of ocean freight. To illustrate: A Liverpool buyer in our market desires, say, to land wheat in Liverpool at \$1 a bushel. Should the ocean freight be 1 cent a bushel to Liverpool, the exporter will deduct from the purchase price 1 cent from the Liverpool price for freight. Should the freight be 5 cents or 10 cents or 20 cents a bushel, the exporter will deduct 5 cents or 10 cents or 20 cents a bushel. Now, let it be observed that the more the exporter deducts the less the farmers will receive, not alone for the quantity which the farmer then sells, but for all the remainder which the farmer may then have on hand, whether it is to be exported or whether it is to be sold for home use.

No other industry whatever can be so powerfully affected by the action of the proposed subsidy to shipping as the staples of agriculture. A decline of 5 cents per hundred in the price of ocean freight means an advance to the farmer of 5 cents per hundred on all his unsold products. An advance of 5 cents per hundred on ocean freight means a decline to the farmer of 5 cents per hundred on all his unsold products.

Now that the matter has been clearly defined, the question properly presents itself. Will the proposed subsidy to shipping tend to decrease the price of ocean freights or will it tend to increase it? That this subsidy shipping measure is not intended to decrease ocean freight charges is evident, for its main purpose is not to do the foreign carrying trade at the "pauper" labor rates of foreign competitors, but the driving away of these competitors so as to permit the protected shipowners to raise ocean freights high enough to enable them—as they claim—to pay their sailors "protected American wages" and, incidentally, to earn for themselves in increased profits the reward of "protected" American capital. Is there any misstatement here? If so, it will be in order for the advocates of the subsidy bill to explain it, for these are among the reasons they give for the passage of their bill. Not, indeed, that they intend to raise the price of ocean freights; oh, no! This is stoutly denied. In some mysterious way ocean freights are to decline, and, again, profits in some other mysterious way are to go up, in order to reward capital and labor on the line of the high-water mark of protection.

Now, will this subsidy measure raise or will it lower ocean freights? This is the question which every statesman in Congress will no doubt put to himself. He will not overlook the fact that a general advance of, say, 10 per cent in ocean freights means a corresponding loss to the farmers of the nation on all the corn, cotton, wheat, hops, tobacco, meat products, and on all other agricultural staples, whether these are to be exported or whether sold for use in the home market. This point is highly significant.

There is yet one other and very important consideration which will no doubt be given this subsidy bill, and that is, What action will be possible by the shipping men when once they succeed in driving away foreign competition to an extent which would place the fixing of the price for ocean freights into their own hands?

Granted that this is a possibility, and what must we further grant? This, that it would be the most dangerous power ever given by legislation into the hands of men eager for money. With power to raise and lower ocean freights at will, they would have the power to raise and lower the home price of several billion dollars' worth of agricultural staples at any and at all times.

There is yet one more consideration which the merits of the case deserve to have brought forward. We find that the shipowners and shipbuilders are working with great zeal for the adoption of their measure, urging its passage on the score of its utility to this nation. But we believe that there is just ground for doubting their sincerity in the matter; decidedly so, if we are to judge from their former statements.

By referring to the Philadelphia papers of July 31, 1895, it will be seen that at a convention in that city, at which almost all the Atlantic coast shipowners and shipbuilders were present, they unanimously passed resolutions condemning the protection of shipping at the expense of agriculture. Their chief spokesman, Mr. Charles H. Cramp, then said that shipping should only be protected when in the same bill there should likewise be provided protection for the staples of agriculture. Accordingly there was a resolution passed unanimously for the joint protection of shipping and of agricultural staples by a bounty on exports.

Realizing the inequality and the economic unsoundness of protecting shipping at the expense of agriculture, Mr. Cramp then said: "When we went to Congress and asked a bounty for ourselves, we committed a grave error, and I am going to do all I can to repair it." These remarks were applauded to the echo, and yet we find that in the face of all this the shipping men are now striving with all zeal and vehemence to do just what they previously condemned as an injustice and an economic wrong.

In view of these several presentations, it now remains to be considered whether, in an attempt at protecting shipping, this protection act is not likely to seriously injure the primary industry, agriculture. Having come to the conclusion that this is very likely to be the case, it will not be difficult for the statesman to decide as to his duty in the matter.

DAVID LUBIN.

NEW YORK, December 15.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to subsidies in any and all forms. We can not build up our lost shipping industry by means of subsidies, however large they may be. Their tendency will ever be to make the industry subsidized depend upon the continuation of that policy for its life and perpetuity, so that such policy must be continued indefinitely or the industry will surely perish. Are we ready to surrender to this demand? Will the taxpayers of this country submit silently to the taking of \$180,000,000, as proposed by the ship-subsidy bill, out of their pockets, to be turned over to the trusts and combines of shipowners?

I do not believe they will. Forbearance can not endure any longer—the day of reckoning will come, and the people will assert their sovereignty. Sir, the party in power, flushed with victory, mad with greed for spoils and power, forgetful of and overriding the teachings of the Republic as set forth in the Declaration of Independence, ignoring the Constitution of our country, has started out upon a conquest for military supremacy and colonial dependencies, foreign to the genius of our institutions as established by our fathers.

Just a few years ago we were astounded at a yearly appropriation of \$1,000,000,000, but by reason of the policy now being pursued by the present Administration we find that the appropriations have grown to over \$1,800,000,000, and to this is to be added an annual gift of \$9,000,000 for twenty years to the shipowners if the subsidy bill is to become a law.

Mr. Chairman, our national progress has been by leaps and not by steps. We have grown from a few colonies to be the grandest power on earth. We are leading the world in science, commerce, and the development of higher civilization. The effect of Ameri-

can energy and skill is seen in the very foremost rank of the world's progress, and yet in the midst of all this national grandeur we find the poor, oppressed shipbuilders and shipowners clamoring for charity ere they perish. Sir, this is the age of the survival of the fittest. We want no laggards. Self-reliance, energy, and push are the watchwords of our national greatness, and let him who can not keep up with the procession get out of the way. We want no camp followers. The God of the universe has permitted, and will ever permit, that some shall fall by the wayside while others reach the desired goal.

Our Government should guarantee to every industry equal start and equal opportunities under the law. Equal rights to all and exclusive privileges to none has ever been the crowning faith and doctrine of the Democratic party, and all legislation that transcends this fundamental idea is subversive of the rights of the great body of the people to the paternal fostering of advantages for the few. [Applause.]

Post-Office Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS C. CATCHINGS,

OF MISSISSIPPI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, February 5, 1901.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13729) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902—

Mr. CATCHINGS said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: My friend from Ohio adverted to the fact that in the report from the Postal Commission submitted by me in regard to the special-facilities fund I had contented myself with saying that there was nothing in the law which made it mandatory upon the Post-Office Department to expend this facility fund. I said all that was necessary, Mr. Chairman. I repeat what I there stated, that if the Post-Office Department is willing to take upon itself the responsibility of saying that it can get as good facilities as they now have, it need not expend one dollar of this money. He is mistaken, Mr. Chairman, when he says that the Postmaster-General has continued to expend this facility fund because he has taken it to be the wish of Congress that he should do so. That is not true at all. I think that the whole testimony submitted to the commission, notably that of Mr. Shallenberger, will satisfy any man that he does not do so because he is unwilling to take upon himself the responsibility of the consequences that might result.

Mr. BROMWELL. May I ask the gentleman whether he has read the question put by Mr. MOODY—

Mr. CATCHINGS. I have read it all and heard it all.

Mr. BROMWELL (continuing). To Mr. Shallenberger, on page 449?

Mr. CATCHINGS. I am going to read it. I have read it within the last half hour.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that the Post-Office Department wants Congress to take the responsibility of withdrawing this facility fund, but Mr. Shallenberger will not say that he can get as good facilities as those which exist to-day, and he never will say it, unless in the future experience should justify him in making the statement. He has said always, as he has said to the different members of the commission, that he thought he could get substantially the same service; that he believed he might get substantially the same service. He never has expressed the opinion that he could get it as it is to-day, and there is nothing in the situation which would justify him in expressing such opinion.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL] has stated, Mr. Chairman, that we had this fast train No. 35 before this fund was expended, in 1893. He does so in the face of the testimony of Mr. Shallenberger. That train is an entirely new, improved train, which has been in operation only since 1893. The truth is Congress authorized this facility fund to be expended in March, 1893. The appropriation could have taken effect, if the Post-Office Department had chosen to make it do so, on the 1st day of July. It did not award it until October, and in the meantime it required the Southern Railroad Company to put on an additional fast train, running with speed equal to the fastest trains that ran from New York to the South, and that was operated for a number of months before the contract was awarded. So that, as a direct result of this special-facility fund, we have to-day trains 35 and 37 leaving New York and going through to New Orleans upon a schedule of time which is not equaled anywhere in the South.

The trains of the Illinois Central, the trains of the Louisville and Nashville, which have been spoken of, do not equal in speed these two magnificent trains which are the direct creation, as the

testimony shows, of this special-facility fund. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL] said that railroad facilities have naturally increased since 1893, but these facilities of which I am speaking, Mr. Chairman, existed in 1893 and have continued from that day down. Now, it is a great service to large sections of this country. The gentleman has stated that prior to 1893 there were ten roads out of Washington. They afforded competition, it would seem, to satisfy any man's ambition; and yet with all that competition the Post-Office Department was unable to secure any service which is at all to be compared with that which exists today. I have been told, and I believe it to be true, that one line going south once had this fund, but surrendered it because it was not willing to make a schedule which the Department insisted upon.

Now these trains are run on schedules fixed by the Department itself; and whereas there was a heterogeneous mass of mail traffic south of Washington prior to 1893, we have now schedules so fixed by the Department itself that every branch road, every intersecting road, has direct connection with the Southern Railroad. The result is that the mails are not only speeded from New York to New Orleans, but they go from Atlanta to Tampa and Jacksonville, to Chattanooga, thence by Memphis to Kansas City and the West; from Chattanooga to Birmingham, Vicksburg, Shreveport, and Dallas, Tex.; so there is a direct benefit resulting to the people living in large and diverse sections of the country which can be traced absolutely and entirely to this increased mail service.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Mississippi permit a question?

Mr. CATCHINGS. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman, because I have confidence in his judgment and discrimination, why is it that there is such a difference in the opinion expressed by gentlemen on the floor as to the opinion of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General? One gentleman gets up and says he opposes it and another gentleman says that the Second Assistant Postmaster-General favors it. I know the gentleman can tell why there is this difference between members on the floor.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I have never heard any man say that the Post-Office Department has ever stated that it desired the continuance of this fund. On the contrary, the Post-Office Department does not desire the continuance of the fund. But you can not read the testimony of General Shallenberger without being satisfied that his whole objection to it is, as he says, that it creates dissatisfaction with other roads; and what he fears is that it is the entering wedge which will lead to similar expenditures as to other railroads. That is the substance and truth of his testimony, and it is the whole of it. They have not expended this money upon any fanciful theory, as expressed by my friend from Ohio, but they have expended it because they did not want to take the responsibility of destroying the magnificent fast service which exists today.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Does the Second Assistant Postmaster-General assert anywhere that this appropriation does not expedite the mail?

Mr. CATCHINGS. He does not.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Has he said that they get the mail more rapidly now than they did before the subsidy?

Mr. CATCHINGS. He says the service has been vastly increased since this subsidy, if you choose to call it such, was voted. He says:

I am clearly of the opinion that the service between Washington and Atlanta, Ga., and New Orleans, and other Southern and Southwestern territory has been very materially improved and the delivery of the mails expedited since March, 1893.

There can be nothing plainer than that.

Mr. BROMWELL. But he does not say by reason of the subsidy. He says it has been improved.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Of course he does not. He states the fact that since the facility fund was extended there has been this magnificent improvement. I submit that the testimony will show that it follows it and was the cause of it, whether the Second Assistant Postmaster-General says so or not. I am going to read you what he says, which is the whole of his testimony upon which this opposition is based, and I will show you that he has never stated that if the fund was withdrawn the service which now exists could be or would be continued, and that is all the impression I desire to make on the committee.

By Mr. MOODY:

Q. If you took off the special-facility train No. 35, which leaves New York at 4.35 a. m., would you lose the connection with the New England mail which arrives at New York in time to connect with that train?

A. We might have to seek some other special arrangement to insure connecting routes. I am not prepared to say that it would not be disastrous if that train should be taken off and nothing substituted for it; but we assume that if the special-facility fund were withdrawn the natural volume of traffic would justify on competing roads sufficient facilities for us to utilize.

Let me say to my friend from Tennessee it is just such statements as that upon which the whole argument on the other side is based. I read again from the testimony of Mr. Shallenberger:

Q. Do not misunderstand me. I do not think anything should be paid by way of subsidy for New England mail. On the contrary, I think it is an outrage to do it; but what would be the train that the New England mail would connect with if this train 35 was taken off?

A. That I could not answer. We would have to cast about for another connection. We would at once appeal to the other roads.

That is always the answer—vague, indefinite, uncertain. Never once does Mr. Shallenberger say that he could give us such service as we have without this extra compensation.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Will the gentleman pardon a suggestion?

Mr. CATCHINGS. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Will the gentleman permit me to read four lines from page 449 of volume 1 of the report of the commission?

Mr. CATCHINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Here is General Shallenberger's statement before that commission:

But, as I have said in my testimony before, looking the country over and knowing the dissatisfaction it creates, we are prepared to say that we think we can secure, in general, better service without the special-facility appropriation.

Mr. CATCHINGS. That confirms the proposition I announced in the beginning of my remarks, that General Shallenberger's whole objection to this appropriation is that he fears it may create discontent among other railroads and may be the entering wedge for similar expenditures to other roads, and so he says that looking the country over—not this line between New York and New Orleans, but looking over the whole country—the Department thinks that in general, not for this line particularly, they could get along better without the special-facility fund.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will my colleague allow me a question?

Mr. CATCHINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Are not the mail connections just as good, the trains just as rapid, the service just as good from New York to Chicago, and from Chicago down by the Illinois Central, as from New York down to Washington and from here down by the Southern Railway? And is it not true that the Southern Railway system receives this subsidy while the Western road does not?

Mr. CATCHINGS. If my friend from Mississippi asks me whether the mail going from New England, Pennsylvania, and New York to New Orleans and the South reaches there as rapidly by way of the Western roads, I answer no.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Of course not, because the distance is greater.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. But the question I ask is whether the connections are not as good, the route just as good, and the time per hour just as good as upon the subsidized route?

Mr. CATCHINGS. It is very likely that some of the Western roads leaving New York do make as good time as is made by these fast mail trains going over the Southern route. It is not true that trains of the Illinois Central road, from Chicago to New Orleans, travel at the same rate. It is not true that the Louisville and Nashville makes as rapid time over its road as is made over these Southern roads.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Just one more question on this point and I am done. The gentleman and I have a choice of routes in coming to Washington. I ask my colleague whether it is not true that he comes by way of Memphis and Louisville and takes the Illinois Central road in preference to these other roads?

Mr. CATCHINGS. No; I never come that way at all. But my colleague's suggestion is no answer to this proposition. You can not make as fast time by that road as you can by coming by way of Meridian and Chattanooga or Birmingham and Atlanta. The travel is shorter by the Southern route, and the rate of travel faster.

Of course when the gentleman and I are traveling, a few hours are a matter of no consequence. I go by one route or the other simply for variety. The difference is only a matter of a few hours. But when we come to the question of expediting the mails the matter is a much more serious one, because it affects business interests at large.

I will say to my colleague from Mississippi that there was a time when these facilities were extended to roads going out from New York to the West. For instance, General Shallenberger says:

When the reduction of 10 per cent was made in the railroad pay, the fast mail trains were to be withdrawn from the New York Central, and we were compelled to make a recommendation—or rather the Department was constrained to make a recommendation at that time—that some special-facility fund should be allowed in order that it might secure the necessary mail facilities to the great West over the trunk lines.

Railroading had not advanced at that time so far as it has at present; nor was the volume of traffic so great on the roads going out from New York; nor was competition so sharp. Hence it was thought wise, and in fact necessary, by the Department that special facilities should be extended to secure fast service to the West. But now, as Mr. Shallenberger says, the case is different. I ask the attention of my colleagues to this language:

Long since we have ceased to pay any appropriations to those lines, because traffic is so heavy and competition so active that we have no trouble in securing the very best mail service.

That could not be said, of course, of the traffic going from New

York to New Orleans over the Southern road. It is not true that the competition is sharp, as has been suggested in connection with this discussion; and I firmly believe, Mr. Chairman, that the vast amount of traffic over this road has been superinduced largely, if not entirely, by reason of this special facility.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him again?

Mr. CATCHINGS. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I shall not interrupt afterwards. I find on page 458 of the testimony here the following questions asked in connection with this matter:

Q. You understand that these systems have reached that point so that you can get just as good speed without the money as with it?

A. That is the idea.

Q. That is the departmental position, is it?

A. Yes.

Now, that is saying a great deal. It is equivalent to saying that this money is simply wasted in this connection.

Mr. CATCHINGS. That, I have already said, is an assumption of the gentleman who was then testifying. I do not dispute that he has so stated. But I do say that he never stated it to be an actual fact in his judgment that this sum of money—this fast mail facility sum—was not money well spent.

The gentleman might, however, have proceeded with his reading a little further, and read a question which I submitted in the same connection and the answer:

Do you think that if these subsidies were withdrawn you could distribute these mails among these different roads so as to secure the competition?

The answer is:

Not unless the special facility roads would say to us, We want to give this up; we want to reduce our schedule time; we want to avail ourselves of the opportunity to give less service. Then we would say to the competing road, Now is your opportunity.

But I have already stated, Mr. Chairman, that the only competing road was the Seaboard Air Line, which had precisely the same identical provision offered to it. It declined to accept the appropriation, because it was unwilling to change its schedule so as to make the time required.

Now, is there a gentleman here on the floor of this House who believes that if the special facilities which have been granted for years past were withdrawn that these two great trains would be run the same as before? Would it be possible for the road to so run them? That is the question with which you must deal. It is a very costly process, gentlemen must remember. If anything was developed in the testimony before the commission, it is that the cost of running trains is governed largely by the speed. Now, would the present speed be maintained if this special-facility fund were withdrawn? I doubt it. The company runs its trains at a rapid speed because they find it pays them.

It may be true, as some gentleman suggested in the course of the debate—I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY]—that it was also something of an advertisement to the railroad company. But the fact is, and we must recognize the fact, that we did not have this fast service until this special-facility fund was expended. We have it now, and the only question for our determination is, Will this House, simply because Mr. Shallenberger has expressed an opinion, in a vague and indefinite way, that the service will be performed without this special fund—I say, shall we take it off and run the risk of crippling, if not destroying, the whole service? Will the committee take the responsibility which the Post-Office Department is unwilling to take in connection with the matter?

Mr. SIMS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, with his consent.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. I only know what our experience has been, but I desired to ask the gentleman this question, in view of his experience and being one of the members of the commission that dealt with the subject, as to what would be the difference, in his judgment, if this special-facility fund or subsidy were withdrawn from this road?

Mr. CATCHINGS. I could not say. I am not myself a railroad man.

Mr. SIMS. But what, in your judgment, would be the difference in the delivery of the mails?

Mr. CATCHINGS. Well, if I judge by the increase of speed that has been produced by this subsidy, I should say that it would be reduced very materially. For instance, to Danville the difference would be from thirteen to eighteen hours' increase; to Greenville, from fourteen to nineteen; to Charlotte, sixteen to twenty-two; and Atlanta and other points in the same proportion.

Mr. BROMWELL. Does the gentleman from Mississippi imagine that the great Southern system would go back to its old slow trains if this subsidy were taken away?

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the extraordinary growth of this service and the interest I feel in it, I would be unwilling to take any speculative step. [Applause.] I think that we ought to deal with the question as a matter of fact, and we can only judge of what the future will produce by what existed

in the past before this subsidy was paid. I would be unwilling, in view of the interests of the people among whom I live, to speculate upon a matter of such vital importance to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I would like to have a few minutes additional time.

Mr. BROMWELL. I ask that the gentleman from Mississippi have ten minutes additional time.

Mr. CATCHINGS. That will be ample.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, I believe that I am entitled to an hour, and if I can have the privilege of doing so I will yield to the gentleman such time as he may desire.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman, unfortunately, has not the floor just now.

Mr. BROMWELL. Then I ask that the gentleman from Mississippi have ten minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will read something more.

Mr. SHATTUC. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CATCHINGS. Yes.

Mr. SHATTUC. Do you believe that there is a sufficient amount of interchangeable passenger business between the North and South in the five months from June 1 to October 31 to justify any such train as that?

Mr. CATCHINGS. I do not. I have gone over that road when I have been the sole passenger in a magnificent car. I answer unhesitatingly that there is no such passenger traffic between New York or New England and the South as would justify the running of these splendid trains.

Mr. SHATTUC. Is it not a fact that the passenger business from the South comes North in the summer time and goes back in the early fall?

Mr. CATCHINGS. That is true, sir; undoubtedly.

Mr. SHATTUC. So that during June, July, August, and September there is no business between the North and the South in either direction excepting purely commercial business.

Mr. CATCHINGS. That is absolutely true, and during that period of time I have no doubt whatever that these magnificent trains are run at a very great loss; but they must be run on this schedule, because the Department fixes it and exacts it, and so they are run.

Mr. SHATTUC. Between Cincinnati and Florida, as soon as the pleasure travel stops in the winter time and spring, is it not a fact that in the summer time the Louisville and Nashville and the Cincinnati Southern road between those commercial centers take off their through limited express?

Mr. CATCHINGS. I have been told that is true.

Mr. SHATTUC. That is true, and I say from personal knowledge in this business that it is my belief that there is no business between the North and South that would justify the running of this train in the summer time, and during at least five months of the year, and that they would not do it unless they were paid for doing it.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. How is it in the West?

Mr. SHATTUC. There is a sufficient amount of traffic between the East and the West so that they can afford to run the trains.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Why does the Illinois Central run its trains all the year around?

Mr. SHATTUC. It does not run all of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. As a matter of fact, they have got the same trains all the year around.

Mr. SHATTUC. There is quite a difference in the business between Chicago and the South and between New York and the South.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not know why. Our commercial business is principally with New York.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Oh, no; we get all our plantation supplies, our machinery, our mules, our flour, and everything of that sort from the West.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to read something more that Mr. Shallenberger said, which will confirm every statement I have made. He was asked this question:

Do you mean to say that prior to the subsidy system these trains over the Southern road outstripped the trains over all other roads to such an extent as to secure thereby the freight and passenger business?

This is his answer:

No; I think these trains have been developed since the period when the subsidy became available.

That is absolutely true. No such trains existed until the subsidy became available, and in making that answer General Shallenberger simply stated the truth. Mr. LOUD asked him this question:

It is a fact, is it not, that you could deliver this mail that goes on the subsidized trains in the city of Charlotte on an unsubsidized train quicker than you now deliver it on a subsidized train? That is, in other words, there is no possible necessity for the subsidized train from New York to Charlotte for

anything except the accumulation of mail in New York between 2.10 a. m. and 4.30 a. m.?

To that General Shallenberger replied:

Well, I am not prepared to say what effect it might have on any one train. We take some risk when we say that we hope to have equally good service if the facility appropriation were withdrawn.

I call the particular attention of gentlemen to that statement of General Shallenberger:

We take some risk when we say that we hope to have equally good service if the facility appropriation were withdrawn. I do not know what effect it might have upon the railroad interests.

And it is because he would take a serious risk, Mr. Chairman, that he is unwilling to assume the responsibility of refusing to pay this subsidy after it has been voted by Congress. That is the whole of it. It is not as my friend from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL] says, that he expends this fund because he takes it to be the wish of Congress that it should be expended. There is nothing in the language of the appropriation to convey any such wish to him. It is entirely optional with him whether he will expend it or not, but here in this answer you will see the full explanation of the fact that they continue to expend this facility appropriation as long as it is voted. It is because they would take considerable risk in refusing to do it, and the Post-Office Department will not take the risk, because they would subject themselves doubtless to very great criticism if, by refusing to make the expenditure, the mail facilities to which our people have become accustomed should be greatly deranged and the time occupied in transporting the mails from New York to the South should be greatly increased.

What the Postmaster-General wants is for Congress to take this responsibility; and if Congress should cut it off, and then the service should fall through, they could say they did not do it, but the legislators did it. That is the whole of it. He was asked as to whether or not, as all the railroads tried to compete for passengers and freight, that they would give the same schedule, and he said that he could not say that they would do so. He had been asked if the expedition of the mails by putting on these two splendid fast trains had not resulted in causing an increase of the schedule time of trains of other roads running south in their effort to compete for passenger traffic, and he answered that it was true that the effect had been thus beneficial, as it had caused all other roads to increase their speed so that they could enter the field of competition. When he was asked if without this facility fund the fast trains would fall back, he answered that he was not prepared to say, but that all other railroads might also fall back in their speed. I have no doubt, myself, on that point. He was asked a leading question by one member of the commission, who was trying to destroy this facility fund, and every lawyer will know what that means:

Then you do not think that the rapidity of trains is increased by the extra mail pay?

Mr. Shallenberger was too wise to answer as he was expected to do. He says:

I would not say that. I think they have been increased, but I think there is now no justification for the Department paying the money to secure—

What?

To secure reasonable service.

In other words, it might be reasonable service in the judgment of the Department if the time was diminished five or six hours between the city of Washington and New Orleans, but it would not be reasonable service to the people who have adjusted their business with reference to these fast trains.

Mr. Shallenberger, from the beginning of his testimony to the end, has never said once that he could procure this service without it.

My friend from Ohio has attempted to impugn the letter of Mr. Shallenberger to Mr. SWANSON in 1898. He says that we must take his last say. There is no conflict between what Mr. Shallenberger said in 1898 and what he said before the Postal Commission. He never said then that he could dispense with the facility fund and maintain the same service. He has not said so since. He does not say so, and he will not say so. Mr. Shallenberger's record has been honorable, upright, and consistent in this matter. He has been struggling for a general principle, and my friend from Ohio has distorted his contention, and says that he does not want this fund, because he could maintain the same service without it. He has never had such a thought or idea. He does not believe he can give us this service without it. No, Mr. Chairman, no word has fallen from his lips that would justify any man in drawing such an inference. He said that he can give a reasonable service, and one that he believes the people in the South should be willing to take rather than to have this principle in our postal service. That is the whole of it.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment? Mr. CATCHINGS. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES. Speaking of Congress making this appropriation and the Department being opposed to it, and part of it being used, the act appropriates \$600,000 for special facilities, and yet

out of this sum the Department found it necessary to use only \$185,125. Now, if it is necessary to have \$600,000, why should the Department have only used \$185,125?

Mr. CATCHINGS. Because possibly the Department was willing to take the responsibility in taking that out for certain roads going to the West. At one time this fund was given to some of the roads going to the West, and it increased the volume of traffic until it became so great that the speed was increased very rapidly, and there was no necessity for it; and in this case the Department was willing to take the responsibility of withdrawing the special-facility fund.

Boston's Commerce.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN F. FITZGERALD,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, January 11, 1901,

On the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts said:

Mr. SPEAKER: At various times the past two days when the river and harbor bill was being discussed I have tried to get the floor to answer and correct the statements that have been made by two or three members of the House relating to the size and importance of the large seaports of the country. Under the rules of the House, the time thus far has been occupied by the members of the committee, and I have not been able to obtain the floor to make a statement concerning Boston's commerce, her right to hold the position as the second commercial seaport of the country, and the duty of Congress to grant the appropriation carried in the pending bill. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin and the House for the opportunity, given me by unanimous consent, to discuss these propositions at this time. In the opening remarks of the chairman of this committee, Mr. BURTON of Ohio, he gave a list of the eight leading ports of this country, and I quote from his remarks:

The eight largest ports in the country, as given by the official statistics contained in the reports of the Chief of Engineers, are, in their order, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Buffalo, Pittsburg (which perhaps you can hardly call a port, being located on the head waters of the Ohio), Baltimore, Cleveland, and Duluth-Superior.

He said at the time, however, with his usual fairness, that some mistake must have been made in the figures, as he felt confident that Boston was much nearer the top of the list. I questioned him as to where he had obtained his figures, and he said they were the official figures of the Board of United States Engineers. These figures included the foreign and domestic tonnage. I immediately telegraphed the Chamber of Commerce at Boston for the figures of last year's foreign and domestic commerce, and I quote the following reply, which I received from the secretary of that body, Mr. E. G. Preston, in this morning's mail:

BOSTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Boston, Mass., January 9, 1901.

HON. JOHN F. FITZGERALD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: Your telegram just at hand. I am very sorry to learn that Mr. LAWRENCE has been called away from Washington, but have no doubt that our matter in relation to the harbor will be well looked out for by those of you who remain.

The commerce of this port amounted, in 1865, to \$45,000,000; in 1875, to \$80,000,000; in 1885, to \$107,000,000; in 1895, to \$170,000,000; and in 1900 to substantially \$160,000,000, exclusive of the in-transit and transshipment trade passing through this port, which amounts to about \$12,000,000 per year.

The tonnage of vessels in the foreign trade entered and cleared at this port during 1900 aggregated 4,225,000 tons, while the vessels in the coastwise trade numbered 21,000 and aggregated 17,000,000 tons.

The size of the vessels which we now have in the foreign trade running to and from this port is, of course, one of the essential features, as you are aware. During the period covered by the statistics stated above the capacity has increased many fold. From the steamer of 2,500 or 3,000 tons we have come to the steamer of 10,000 to 12,000 tons dead-weight capacity, and from drawing 23 feet to 35 feet 6 inches, which is the draft of the largest steamers at the present time in this trade.

In the transportation of passengers the growth of the port during the last few years has been little short of marvelous. While I have not the exact figures of the arrivals of steamer passengers last year, they will amount to over 20,000, and the cabin passengers to probably 9,000 more. The steamer passengers will show an increase of 40 to 45 per cent over 1898, and the cabin passengers of 50 per cent over 1898, and over 1894 of 300 to 400 per cent.

This is the beginning of a business which is destined to grow into very great proportions at this port, if we have water enough in our channels to bring the ships in and out at all stages of the tide, thus saving vexatious delays, particularly annoying to home-coming passengers. While a delay of a tide to a vessel of one-half or one-quarter the size of the present steamships, with a small or no passenger list, was relatively of slight importance, with the ships of the present day—with the immense crew and passenger list, cabin and steerage, of twelve or thirteen hundred souls—it becomes a matter of the first moment.

I will now quote the figures which appear in the Army Engineer's report, which were the basis of Mr. BURTON's statements:

COMMERCIAL STATISTICS.

The accompanying commercial statistics for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, have been furnished by the collector of customs at Boston, Mass.

Amount of revenue collected:

1898	\$10,678,290.95
1899	15,649,276.26
1900	18,871,848.99

Shipping.	1898.		1899.		1900.	
	Number.	Tons.	Number.	Tons.	Number.	Tons.
Entrances:						
Foreign	1,780	1,772,088	1,587	1,999,784	1,643	2,016,121
Domestic	212	136,402	193	140,011	217	219,473
Clearances:						
Foreign	1,673	1,541,315	1,426	1,710,822	1,504	1,600,587
Domestic	244	120,557	291	161,936	305	248,005

	1898.	1899.	1900.
Importations:			
Merchandise	\$51,475,094	\$52,101,069	\$72,161,087
Coin and bullion	653,740	114,135	134,602
Exportations:			
Foreign:			
Merchandise	1,402,676	2,437,731	1,243,486
Coin and bullion		2,364	3,384
Domestic:			
Merchandise	116,129,227	125,600,258	110,946,023
Coin and bullion	8,100	19,505	22,500

I was amazed at the discrepancy in the figures as reported by Mr. Preston and the collector of the port. Mr. Preston's figures showed the number of vessels entering and clearing in the coastwise trade to be 21,000, with a tonnage of 17,000,000, while the figures quoted above, which were used by Mr. BURTON and other members of the House in figuring the relative rank of the ports of the country, show the number of vessels entering and clearing to be 529, with a tonnage of 467,568.

When I saw these figures and compared them, I ceased wondering why Boston was not found in the United States engineer's list among the 8 leading ports of the country.

I called at once at the Treasury Department to find upon what basis the collector's figures rested, and I was told that the figures reported by the collector of the port of Boston of domestic business included only the business done by vessels operating between Boston and far-off domestic ports, such as points on the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific coast. The Treasury official informed me also that no record of the entrance or clearance of vessels engaged in the domestic trade between any ports of the United States was kept by the Treasury Department, and the only way to obtain this information was through the various boards of trade or chambers of commerce at the different ports.

Inasmuch as the figures quoted by Mr. BURTON upon which he rested his statement were the figures of the boards of trade and the Treasury Department, I claim the same right for Boston, and, using the figures received from the Boston Chamber of Commerce and quoted above, Boston is the second port in the country to-day.

To further confirm this statement I wish to present to the House at the present time official statistics obtained from the Treasury Department on the foreign trade of the five leading ports of the country.

Total value of imports and exports of merchandise during the fiscal year ending with June 30, 1900, at the following ports:

Port.	Imports.	Exports.	Total.
New York	\$537,237,283	\$518,694,471	\$1,055,931,753
Boston	12,185,900	112,185,555	124,371,455
Baltimore	19,045,279	115,530,378	134,575,657
Philadelphia	51,806,032	78,408,031	130,214,063
New Orleans	17,490,811	115,858,764	133,349,575

Total value of imports and exports of merchandise during the fiscal year ending with June 30, 1899, at the following ports:

Port.	Imports.	Exports.	Total.
New York	\$510,426,603	\$349,051,791	\$859,478,394
Boston	62,876,666	71,201,944	134,078,610
Baltimore	13,140,200	73,983,009	87,123,209
Philadelphia	53,936,315	57,410,683	111,346,998
New Orleans	14,658,163	100,129,801	114,787,964

The fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, gives hardly a fair test of Boston's foreign export trade. A large number of vessels were taken by the British Government for use as transports in the Boer war. That Boston suffered most in this respect is easily seen by a comparison of the amount of foreign exports of the five leading ports for the years ending June 30, 1899 and 1900.

Value of foreign exports.

Year.	New York.	Boston.	Philadel- phia.	Baltimore.	New Or- leans.
1899	\$450,444,217	\$128,137,149	\$90,950,065	\$107,156,240	\$87,903,277
1900	518,834,471	112,195,555	78,408,031	115,530,378	115,858,764

Every port in this group gained except Boston. The English Government in selecting its vessels demanded the largest and newest type of freight and passenger carriers existing, and as Boston was the American port of the largest proportion of these vessels she naturally suffered most.

If the figures of 1899 are used, and I think they afford the safest basis for comparison, Boston is second to New York in imports and exports, and shows a bigger net gain in her foreign trade than any of the five ports above mentioned.

In order that the House may have the full benefit of my investigation of this matter, as well as to be fair to all parts of the country, I quote the official figures of the Treasury Department, giving the figures of the customs revenue received at the nine leading ports for the fiscal year 1900:

Customs revenue of largest ports for fiscal year 1900.

New York	\$152,333,877
Philadelphia	20,214,023
Boston	18,767,046
Chicago	7,941,280
San Francisco	7,088,381
New Orleans	6,828,380
Baltimore	2,766,818
St. Louis	1,501,567
Detroit	1,003,640

I also present the official figures taken from the report of the Treasury Department of the customs revenue of the six leading ports the past twenty-two years:

Statement exhibiting the receipts from duties on imports of merchandise at the port of New York for the last twenty years ended June 30, compared with other leading ports of the United States for the same period.

Year ended June 30—	New York.	Boston.	Philadelphia.	Baltimore.	New Orleans.	San Francisco.	Aggregate of all other ports of the United States.	Total, United States.
1879	\$96,839,023.85	\$13,481,263.61	\$3,775,081.77	\$1,899,128.73	\$1,237,008.14	\$6,151,136.12	\$7,264,338.42	\$135,691,555.64
1880	130,431,007.56	20,579,160.98	12,517,287.30	2,900,146.76	2,081,204.87	6,610,141.10	10,794,714.77	184,919,003.34
1881	138,300,312.45	21,145,129.52	11,004,877.52	2,867,660.49	2,492,307.23	6,167,493.04	14,493,243.69	196,471,054.04
1882	151,529,898.82	23,601,287.66	11,778,725.05	2,953,922.82	3,061,189.74	8,372,254.89	17,674,913.09	219,032,187.07
1883	146,581,223.14	22,216,348.40	12,090,912.49	2,984,583.00	1,975,502.65	10,183,165.19	16,850,205.10	213,371,930.67
1884	133,896,902.91	21,882,630.30	12,814,741.62	2,241,441.56	1,901,761.98	6,849,348.55	14,069,704.97	193,716,531.89
1885	125,313,677.43	19,578,902.42	12,379,230.11	1,884,630.53	1,494,610.02	6,629,990.03	13,537,642.61	180,815,743.15
1886	132,635,369.33	20,925,074.12	14,540,760.17	2,531,984.41	1,304,362.88	5,871,481.55	14,588,781.99	192,397,844.45
1887	146,158,589.32	22,967,854.15	17,813,517.84	2,994,779.49	2,312,937.16	6,696,225.10	17,789,816.26	216,723,719.31
1888	144,426,619.94	21,236,904.02	18,589,090.61	2,923,880.74	2,761,873.32	8,965,684.47	19,695,844.27	218,599,867.37
1889	146,909,382.97	20,805,230.37	22,306,725.45	2,863,416.80	2,765,400.67	6,667,932.04	18,039,612.75	223,357,701.03
1890	153,900,052.00	19,262,178.82	24,284,774.11	2,865,010.76	2,634,731.68	8,356,328.15	20,784,222.74	230,102,724.47
1891	146,781,754.18	17,903,014.27	20,506,826.13	3,689,830.86	2,043,044.08	7,843,382.54	20,141,019.71	219,001,871.77
1892	119,699,826.57	14,367,250.25	9,241,316.19	3,073,308.79	1,499,695.28	7,921,232.79	20,784,222.74	170,816,051.71
1893	137,301,587.65	15,082,150.71	11,433,877.73	4,559,016.82	1,450,028.92	7,491,151.50	24,957,970.26	202,815,783.59
1894	87,424,445.71	8,909,676.21	7,767,084.48	2,990,750.36	1,271,203.20	6,926,084.90	17,629,285.76	131,818,500.63
1895	103,633,983.83	9,406,934.85	11,692,337.25	2,906,168.60	1,062,830.54	6,619,450.70	17,818,908.75	152,158,617.45
1896	108,710,403.28	11,137,861.22	13,033,024.23	2,785,379.16	1,700,832.19	5,491,617.03	17,629,285.76	160,021,751.67
1897	123,462,549.48	13,090,379.69	16,599,254.78	2,300,874.28	3,701,595.91	6,147,486.99	11,161,985.62	176,554,126.05
1898	103,155,416.27	10,618,616.48	12,559,669.24	1,745,139.37	1,409,971.32	5,363,579.84	14,664,069.83	149,575,062.35
1899	136,772,616.96	15,006,781.72	22,344,052.30	2,002,163.73	3,829,032.16	6,570,136.37	18,983,496.48	206,128,481.75
1900	158,253,780.76	18,808,908.57	20,296,061.81	2,849,565.53	6,843,682.24	7,083,942.62	25,619,904.30	231,779,845.62

These figures show that Philadelphia collects, next to New York, the largest amount of revenue at the present time. Boston, in the twenty-two years reported above, is second to New York thirteen times and Philadelphia nine. In the value of both imports and exports, however, as shown in a previous part of my remarks, Boston is easily second. When we are deepening our harbors bulk, not quality, is to be considered. It seems to me, therefore, when the facts which I have placed before the House are analyzed, that Boston occupies the place which her Representatives on this floor have always claimed for her—the second commercial port of the country.

Now, on the merits of the bill: I was sorry to observe, during the progress of this debate, that there are still many men opposed to appropriations for river and harbor improvements. They can not, indeed, be alive to the marvelous changes which these improvements have brought about in the past half of a century. Mulhall in 1896 said that in the preceding fifty years distributive energy had increased three times as fast as production proper. The comforts, joys, and happiness of life ever increase as new avenues of commerce and civilization are opened up. The opposition to river and harbor appropriations generally come from those in the inland States, who seldom have a chance to observe the great benefits derived from these improvements.

If they are not near enough the coast to witness the marvelous changes that recent years have brought about in ocean carrying commerce they can not have failed to notice the great decrease in the cost of transporting to foreign lands the products of the farm, the factory, and the workshop in their district. I hold in my hand a telegram which I received a few hours ago from William H. Lincoln, one of the great steamship owners of this country and the president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, in answer to a telegram I sent him for information as to the increase of the size of ocean-going steamships the past few years and the decrease in the cost of exporting grain.

TO HON. JOHN F. FITZGERALD,

Washington:

Sazonia, 14,000 tons; 600 feet; 32 feet 6 inches draft. *Ivornia*, same. *Devonian*, 10,400 tons; 570 feet; 32 feet 6 inches draft.

Larger steamer building. No particulars. Engaging grain now 2 pence bushel; formerly 9 pence. Average former draft steamers, 23 feet, and about 3,000 tons.

W. H. LINCOLN.

BOSTON, MASS., January 11, 1901.

These facts tell the story in a nutshell and prove to this House and the country that it is the farmer and the workman who receive the benefit of these appropriations and not the ports where the money is spent, except in a small degree. Consult the manifest of any of the large freighters sailing out of Boston Harbor and you will find that not 10 per cent of the exports are the products of Massachusetts. How long would the farmer in the West be able to sell his grain in open competition in the markets of the world if Congress followed the implied suggestions of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HERBURN], who in his remarks of yesterday ridiculed the idea, which he said was being acted upon in all the large seaport cities, of deepening the harbors as the constantly increasing size of the modern freight carrier demanded. I was surprised at this statement.

Usually he approaches public questions upon this floor with marked ability and unanswerable logic. He has been counted as one of the foremost champions of American commercial interests, and one of the noted pieces of legislation that passed this body last session bears his name. I refer to the Nicaragua Canal bill. He practically asked the House yesterday if it was proposed to continue deepening the harbors of the great seaports of the country in proportion as the commerce-carrying vessels of the world increased their draft. He protested against such a policy, and pointed to New York and Boston as the chief offenders.

I was surprised at the statement when it was made, and the more I have thought over the matter the more my surprise has increased. It is not a question in my mind as to whether we will do it; we must do it. We can not lag behind in the fight for commercial and industrial supremacy, particularly when our power of production is so far outside our power of consumption. The world moves and we must move with it, and if we are to become competitors for the world's markets we must undersell our rivals. We must meet the competition of other nations not by standing still and waiting for the customer to come to us. That is the old doctrine, which read, "Everything comes to him who waits." The present age gives you nothing. You must fight for everything you get, and as with men so with nations.

If you wish success in your business, you must hustle. Therefore my surprise at the gentleman from Iowa suggesting that because of a comparatively small outlay, compared with the benefit to be derived by all parts of the country, we should hesitate to deepen our harbors to provide for the great leviathans which will control the commerce of the future. We are going at a terrific pace. When the nineteenth century dawned, the men of that day used the same primitive means of locomotion as was used eighteen hundred years before, in the days of Caesar.

Horses and camels, sails and boats were used for passenger and freight traffic at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Asia and Africa were in an impenetrable and invulnerable darkness, unknown to anyone except the daring and venturesome explorer. Egypt was sought only by those desiring to study the Pyramids and the Sphinx. China was the land of mystery and pig-tail millions, shut off from civilization and light. America was then in her infancy, only a short while before having become a free and independent nation. Europe was considered the center of intelligence, progress, and civilization. If we stop to consider for a moment the marvelous changes of the past one hundred years, they seem incredible, yet they but emphasize the fact that we must be ready at all times to meet the results of the inventive genius and magnificent development of the present rapid age.

Think for a moment what a hundred years has brought forth. This century received from its predecessor the horse; we bequeath the bicycle, the locomotive, and the automobile. We received the goose quill; we bequeath the typewriter. We received the scythe; we bequeath the mowing machine. We received the sickle; we bequeath the harvester. We received the hand printing press; we bequeath the Hoe cylinder press. We received the painted canvas; we bequeath lithography, photography, and color photography. We received the cotton and woolen loom; we bequeath the factory.

We received gunpowder; we bequeath nitroglycerine. We received the tallow dip; we bequeath the arc light. We received the flintlock; we bequeath the automatic-firing Maxim gun. Receiving nothing, we bequeath the anæsthetic properties of sulphur ether, by means of which to a great extent human life has been saved and pain prevented. We received the beacon signal fire; we bequeath the telephone and wireless telegraphy. We received ordinary light; we bequeath the X-ray. We received the old-fashioned sailing ship; we bequeath the ocean greyhound and freight leviathan.

Why, Mr. Speaker, it is only as far back as 1819 that the first steamer, the *Savannah*, crossed the ocean. One hundred and twenty years ago a couple of stages and a dozen horses carried all the merchandise between New York and Boston, the two big commercial centers of the country. Boston was termed the "Hub." How little that designation applies at the present time! About half a century ago it required sixty days to go from Boston to the Missouri River, and the *North American Review*, speaking of this country in 1858, said:

The Missouri River is the termination of a vast ocean desert over 1,000 miles in breadth, which it is possible to travel, if at all, with caravans of camels, and which interposes a final barrier to the establishment of large communities, agricultural, commercial, or even pastoral.

How would that description fit that country now? In place of a desert and wilderness there thrive thousands of farms, producing millions of bushels of grain and feeding numberless cattle carried to the seaports, not by caravans of camels, but by huge iron steeds breathing fire and smoke, built and operated by Boston capital and Boston enterprise.

Distance to-day is not measured in miles, but in hours. Less than five days is the time required to pass from the Eastern to the Western coast. Porto Rico and Cuba are nearer Chicago to-day than was the Louisiana Territory at the time of its purchase, and Hawaii, aye, even the Philippines, are nearer to New York than California was when it was annexed, a little more than half a century ago. There are members of this House who can remember when it cost the price of a barrel of flour to-day to carry it a hundred miles anywhere in the United States, yet to-day the amount of wheat that makes a barrel of flour is carried from the farmer's hand to the consumer in Europe at a cost of a very few cents. [Applause.]

During the past seven years the increase in the number of vessels entering and leaving Boston has been 15 per cent, while the increase in the tonnage has been 40 per cent. This shows the evolution in our ocean carrying commerce.

Now, if the situation is such that certain vessels can not now sail out of Boston fully loaded because of their immense draft, and these increases have come about in the past few years, and the size of the vessels keeps increasing, and every sensible member of this House knows that this will continue in the evolution of our sea carrying commerce, how will they get in and out of Boston Harbor? How will they get in and out of any harbor on the Atlantic coast? There is not a 35-foot harbor to-day along the Atlantic coast, yet there are vessels building of nearly that draft.

Perhaps with the coming of the twentieth century air ships may be invented to sail from this country to other parts of the world. [Laughter.] Unless something of this kind happens, the members of this House from the central and western sections of the country, if they want their products to compete with the rest of the world, must join with the members from the seacoast States in securing liberal appropriations for harbor improvements in order to provide for the cheaper transportation which follows the increased carrying capacity of ships.

Nothing better illustrates the marvelous change in the character

of the freight carrier of the day than to cite my own experience since becoming a member of this body. I have been here but six years, yet during that time I have fought with my colleagues for appropriations for a channel 1,000 feet wide and 27 feet deep; then for a channel 1,200 feet wide and 30 feet deep, and am now fighting for a channel 1,200 and 1,500 feet wide and 35 feet deep.

The Leyland Line estimates that 75 per cent of the freight carried by its steamers comes from the West and Southwest; the Warren Line 79 per cent, and the Allen Line 76 per cent.

Boston has contributed her share to the great reduction so beneficial to the farmer in the West and Southwest, and is willing to do more if fairly treated by the Government.

Since 1825 Boston has received for harbor improvements about \$5,000,000, while she has paid into the national Treasury through the custom-house more than \$500,000,000. The State of Massachusetts, during the past quarter of a century, has expended two millions and a half, and will appropriate more the present year. Only the other day the board of railroad commissioners approved the authorization of a loan of \$2,500,000 for the construction of docks, terminals, and the largest grain elevator on the Atlantic coast. New docks have been built by the State; one is now in operation, and more are to follow.

I think I can appeal with confidence to the members of this House from all sections of the country to stand by Massachusetts and by her first and magnificent city—metropolitan Boston. No appeal ever went forth in this House for justice, whether in behalf of the North, South, East, or West, but found a willing ear in the Massachusetts Representatives upon this floor. No crisis ever faced the country that found Massachusetts wanting in patriotism or good deeds. No misfortune ever befell a sister Commonwealth or a municipality or a village in the confines of this nation, even before an appeal was made, but what Massachusetts and Boston were the first to proffer assistance and help with food and clothing and money to alleviate the suffering of the unfortunate and afflicted people. [Applause.]

Boston Harbor is one of the grandest in the world. It is situated most advantageously, and is naturally of a good depth, secure,

and unobstructed by sand bars or shoals. It contains 60 square miles of anchorage ground, and nearly a score of steamship lines operate between it and foreign ports.

Boston Harbor was the scene of the first open act of rebellion against British tyranny and oppression, and its interests are therefore sacred to the 76,000,000 of people in this country to-day.

The Boston tea party and the Boston port bill were the stepping stones in the formation of this great Republic of ours.

Boston is to-day the recognized home of art and science and music and literature. Her citizens have always aimed to keep her in the position she occupied when the nation was born—the first city in the affections of the people of the country. More young men and women, more boys and girls, walk her streets to-day—strangers within the gates of the city—seeking education in everything which tends to make life better and grander, than can be found in any city of the country.

Boston is a well-governed city. Her streets, her avenues, her thoroughfares are well cared for and well lighted. A high sense of civic duty is demanded by the citizens, and no great scandals in municipal administration have ever appeared.

The State of Massachusetts and the city of Boston have been lavish in their expenditures to make the city's health and beauty commensurate with its commercial importance. During the past fifteen years more than \$25,000,000 have been spent in the construction of parks and boulevards, \$10,000,000 on the building of a sewerage system, and \$30,000,000 for a pure and adequate supply of water for metropolitan Boston.

These large appropriations, unequalled by any city in the world of equal size, prove the public spirit of her citizens and show her worthy now, as she was a century and a quarter ago, when her patriotic sons struck the first blow for American freedom and American liberty. [Loud applause.]

Last year the exports from this country amounted to \$1,500,000,000, while the imports amounted to \$825,000,000. This is a phenomenal showing, but it is bound to increase. Boston wants part of this commerce. She must have it, and she knows that this House will treat her demands justly and equitably. [Applause.]

INDEX

TO THE

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Adamson, W. C. (*a Representative from Georgia*)

Remarks by, on

Hazing at West Point 332.

Agricultural Appropriation Bill

Remarks on, by

Mr. Brosius 173.
Mr. King 244.

Allen, Henry D. (*a Representative from Kentucky*)

Remarks by, on

Shipping subsidy 372.

Appropriations

Remarks on, by

Mr. Cannon 228.
Mr. Cochran of Missouri 247.
Mr. Livingston 229.
Mr. Maddox 254.

Army Reorganization

Remarks on, by

Mr. Boutell of Illinois 23.
Mr. Bowersock 24.
Mr. Brownlow 26.
Mr. Butler of North Carolina 106.
Mr. Clayton of New York 23.
Mr. Crowley 11.
Mr. Dick 101.
Mr. Fitzgerald of New York 23.
Mr. Jett 25.
Mr. Shafroth 3.
Mr. Stark 14.
Mr. J. R. Williams of Illinois 8.

Baltimore and Ohio Railroad

Remarks by Mr. Cowherd on grade crossings of 181.

Baltimore and Potomac Railroad

Remarks by Mr. Meyer on grade crossings of 358.

Barney, Samuel S. (*a Representative from Wisconsin*)

Remarks by, on

Oleomargarine 9.

Bartholdt, Richard (*a Representative from Missouri*)

Remarks by, on

Louisiana Purchase Exposition 347.

Bartlett, Charles L. (*a Representative from Georgia*)

Remarks by, on

Oleomargarine 209.

Bell, John C. (*a Representative from Colorado*)

Remarks by, on

Use of Pension Office for Inaugural ball 247.

Boreing, Vincent (*a Representative from Kentucky*)

Remarks by, on

War-revenue reduction 352.

Boutell, Henry S. (*a Representative from Illinois*)

Remarks by, on

Army reorganization 23.
Oleomargarine 30.

Bowersock, J. D. (*a Representative from Kansas*)

Remarks by, on

Army canteen 24.

Brick, Abram L. (*a Representative from Indiana*)

Remarks by, on

Statue of Count Casimer Pulaski 338.

Bromwell, Jacob H. (*a Representative from Ohio*)

Remarks by, on

Parcels post 33.
War-revenue reduction 33.

Brosius, Marriott (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*)

Remarks by, on

Agricultural appropriation bill 178.
Reapportionment 79.

Brownlow, Walter P. (*a Representative from Tennessee*)

Remarks by, on

Army reorganization 26.

Burkett, E. J. (*a Representative from Nebraska*)

Remarks by, on

Reapportionment 55.

Butler, Marion (*a Senator from North Carolina*)

Remarks by, on

Army reorganization 166.
Railway-mail pay 271.
Simmons, F. M.: credentials of 360.

Caffery, Donelson (*a Senator from Louisiana*)

Remarks by, on

Shipping subsidy 227.

Cannop, Joseph G. (*a Representative from Illinois*)

Remarks by, on

Appropriations 328.

Catchings, Thomas C. (*a Representative from Mississippi*)

Remarks by, on

Special mail facilities 373.

Civil Service

Remarks on, by

Mr. King 170.
Mr. Mudd 170.

Clarke, Frank G. (*a Representative from New Hampshire*)

Eulogy in House on 227.

Clayton, Bertram T. (*a Representative from New York*)

Remarks by, on

Army reorganization 23.
Hazing at West Point 350.

Cochran, Charles F. (*a Representative from Missouri*)

Remarks by, on

Appropriations 247.

Cousins, Robert G. (*a Representative from Iowa*)

Remarks by, on

Oleomargarine 31.

Cowherd, William S. (*a Representative from Missouri*)

Remarks by, on

Baltimore and Ohio Railroad grade crossings 181.

Cromer, George W. (*a Representative from Indiana*)

Remarks by, on

Rural free delivery 340.

Crowley, Joseph B. (*a Representative from Illinois*)

Remarks by, on

Army reorganization 11.

Crumpacker, Edgar D. (a Representative from Indiana)

Remarks by, on
Reapportionment 67.

Cuba

Remarks by Mr. Scudder on relations with 357.

Currency

Remarks by Mr. Lovering on 196.

Dahle, Herman B. (a Representative from Wisconsin)

Remarks by, on
Oleomargarine 57.

Daly, William D. (a Representative from New Jersey)

Eulogy in House on 208.

Davenport, Stanley W. (a Representative from Pennsylvania)

Remarks by, on
Wilkes Barre, Pa., public building 242.

Davis, Cushman K. (a Senator from Minnesota)

Eulogy in House on 208.

Dick, Charles (a Representative from Ohio)

Remarks by, on
Army reorganization 101.

Eulogies

On Frank G. Clarke 227.
On William D. Daly 208.
On Cushman K. Davis 208.
On John H. Gear 368.
On Alfred C. Harmer 41, 324, 334.
On John H. Hoffecker 294, 353.

Finley, D. E. (a Representative from South Carolina)

Remarks by, on
River and harbor appropriation bill 99.

Fitzgerald, John J. (a Representative from New York)

Remarks by, on
Army reorganization 29.
Buttermilk Channel improvement 365.
Navy appropriation bill 344.

Fitzgerald, John F. (a Representative from Massachusetts)

Remarks by, on
Commerce of Boston 376.
Post-Office appropriation bill 353.

Foss, George E. (a Representative from Illinois)

Remarks by, on
River and harbor appropriation bill 154.

Fox, Andrew F. (a Representative from Mississippi)

Remarks by, on
Reapportionment 75.

Guinea, John Wesley (a Representative from Tennessee)

Remarks by, on
Shipping subsidy 310.
War-revenue reduction 310.

Gamble, Robert J. (a Representative from South Dakota)

Remarks by, on
Davis, Cushman K.: death of 208.

Gardner, John J. (a Representative from New Jersey)

Remarks by, on
Daly, William D.: death of 208.

Gear, John H. (a Senator from Iowa)

Eulogy in House on 368.

Glynn, Martin H. (a Representative from New York)

Remarks by, on
Hudson River improvement 164.

Grosvenor, Charles H. (a Representative from Ohio)

Remarks by, on
Shipping subsidy 332.
The negro problem of the South 68.

Harmer, Alfred C. (a Representative from Pennsylvania)

Eulogies in House on 41, 334.
Eulogy in Senate on 324.

Hawaiian Silver Coinage

Remarks of Mr. Knox on 326.

Hoffecker, John H. (a Representative from Delaware)

Eulogies in House on 294, 356.

Irrigation

Remarks on, by
Mr. Newlands 297.
Mr. Stewart of Nevada 18.

Jett, Thomas M. (a Representative from Illinois)

Remarks by, on
Army reorganization 25.

Jones, William A. (a Representative from Virginia)

Remarks by, on
Reapportionment 288.

King, William H. (a Representative from Utah)

Remarks by, on
Agricultural appropriation bill 244.
Civil service 170.
Navy appropriation bill 170.
River and harbor appropriation bill 260.

Knox, William S. (a Representative from Massachusetts)

Remarks by, on
Hawaiian silver coinage 326.

Lentz, John J. (a Representative from Ohio)

Remarks by, on
Philippine Islands 225.
Postal telegraph 210.
The tyranny of the majority 212.
True Democracy 210.

Livingston, Leonidas F. (a Representative from Georgia)

Remarks by, on
Appropriations 329.

Louisiana Purchase Exposition

Remarks on, by
Mr. Bartholdt 317.
Mr. Meyer 370.
Mr. Tawney 312.

Lovering, William C. (a Representative from Massachusetts)

Remarks by, on
Currency 196.

McCleary, James T. (a Representative from Minnesota)

Remarks by, on
Harmer, Alfred C.: death of 334.

Maddox, John W. (a Representative from Georgia)

Remarks by, on
Appropriations 254.
War-revenue reduction 42.

Mann, James R. (a Representative from Illinois)

Remarks by, on
Chicago post-office 170.
River and harbor appropriation bill 93.
Russian sugar 318.

Meyer, Adolph (a Representative from Louisiana)

Remarks by, on
Baltimore and Potomac Railroad grade crossings 358.
Louisiana Purchase Exposition 370.
Monument to prison-ship martyrs 329.
Reapportionment 47.

Military Academy. See WEST POINT.**Money, H. D. (a Senator from Mississippi)**

Remarks by, on
Harmer, Alfred C.: death of 324.

Moody, William H. (a Representative from Massachusetts)

Remarks by, on
Railway mail pay 198.

Mudd, Sydney E. (*a Representative from Maryland*)

Remarks by, on

Civil service 170.

Navy appropriation bill 170, 360.

Muller, Nicholas (*a Representative from New York*)

Remarks by, on

River and harbor appropriation bill 93.

Navy Appropriation Bill

Remarks on, by

Mr. Fitzgerald of New York 344.

Mr. King 170.

Mr. Mudd 170, 360.

Newlands, Francis G. (*a Representative from Nevada*)

Remarks by, on

Storage reservoirs 297.

Norton, James A. (*a Representative from Ohio*)

Remarks by, on

War-revenue reduction 41.

Oleomargarine

Remarks on taxation of, by

Mr. Barney 9.

Mr. Bartlett 200.

Mr. Boutell of Illinois 30.

Mr. Cousins 31.

Mr. Dahle 57.

Mr. H. C. Smith of Michigan 22.

Mr. Thomas of Iowa 18.

Mr. Zenor 12.

Overstreet, Jesse (*a Representative from Indiana*)

Remarks by, on

Exchange of United States coins (Appendix 90).

Parcels Post

Remarks by Mr. Bromwell on 33.

Philippine Islands

Remarks on, by

Mr. Lentz 225.

Mr. Shafroth 3.

Post-Office Appropriation Bill

Remarks on, by

Mr. Butler of North Carolina 271.

Mr. Catchings 373.

Mr. Fitzgerald of Massachusetts 353.

Mr. Moody of Massachusetts 183.

Mr. Swanson 236.

Pulaski, Casimer

Remarks by Mr. Brick on statue of 338.

Reapportionment

Remarks on, by

Mr. Brosius 79.

Mr. Burkett 55.

Mr. Crumpacker 67.

Mr. Fox 75.

Mr. Jones of Virginia 233.

Mr. Meyer 47.

Mr. Rixey 45.

Mr. Shaw 82.

Mr. H. C. Smith of Michigan 153.

Richardson, James D. (*a Representative from Tennessee*)

Remarks by, on

Gear, John H: death of 368.

River and Harbor Appropriation Bill

Remarks on, by

Mr. Finley 90.

Mr. Fitzgerald of New York 363.

Mr. Foss 154.

Mr. Glynn 164.

Mr. King 200.

Mr. Mann 93.

Mr. Muller 93.

Mr. Ruppert 91.

Mr. Scudder 200, 260, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294.

Mr. Small 333.

Mr. H. C. Smith of Michigan 163.

Mr. Sparkman 156.

Mr. Thomas of North Carolina 153.

Rixey, John F. (*a Representative from Virginia*)

Remarks by, on

Reapportionment 45.

Ruppert, Jacob, jr. (*a Representative from New York*)

Remarks by, on

River and harbor appropriation bill 91.

War-revenue reduction 43.

Rural Free Delivery

Remarks on, by

Mr. Cromer 340.

Mr. William Alden Smith 341.

Russian Sugar

Remarks by Mr. Mann on countervailing duty on 318.

Scudder, Townsend (*a Representative from New York*)

Remarks by, on

Relations with Cuba 357.

River and harbor appropriation bill 206, 260, 290, 291, 292,

293, 294.

Shipping subsidy 306.

War-revenue reduction 331.

Shafroth, John F. (*a Representative from Colorado*)

Remarks by, on

Army reorganization and Philippine policy 3.

Shattuc, William B. (*a Representative from Ohio*)

Remarks by, on

Hoffecker, John H: death of 356.

Shaw, Albert D. (*a Representative from New York*)

Remarks by, on

Reapportionment 82.

Shipping Subsidy

Remarks on, by

Mr. Allen of Kentucky 372.

Mr. Caffery 227.

Mr. Gaines 310.

Mr. Grovesnor 332.

Mr. Scudder 308.

Sibley, Joseph C. (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*)

Remarks by, on

Harmer, Alfred C: death of 41.

Sims, T. W. (*a Representative from Tennessee*)

Remarks by, on

New England in American politics 367.

Small, John H. (*a Representative from North Carolina*)

Remarks by, on

Inland waterway 335.

Smith, Henry C. (*a Representative from Michigan*)

Remarks by, on

Oleomargarine 22.

Reapportionment 153.

River and harbor appropriation bill 162.

Smith, Wm. Alden (*a Representative from Michigan*)

Remarks by, on

Rural free delivery 341.

Sparkman, Stephen M. (*a Representative from Florida*)

Remarks by, on

River and harbor appropriation bill 156.

Stark, William L. (*a Representative from Nebraska*)

Remarks by, on

Army reorganization 14.

Stewart, James F. (*a Representative from New Jersey*)

Remarks by, on

Clarke, Frank G: death of 227.

Stewart, William M. (*a Senator from Nevada*)

Remarks by, on

Irrigation 183.

Suloway, Cyrus A. (*a Representative from New Hampshire*)

Remarks by, on

Hoffecker, John H: death of 294.

Swanson, Claude A. (*a Representative from Virginia*)

Remarks by, on

Special mail facilities 266.

Tawney, James A. (a Representative from Minnesota)*Remarks by, on*

Louisiana Purchase Exposition 312.

Thomas, Charles R. (a Representative from North Carolina)*Remarks by, on*

River and harbor appropriation bill 153.

Thomas, Lot (a Representative from Iowa)*Remarks by, on*

Oleomargarine 18.

Underwood, Oscar W. (a Representative from Alabama)*Remarks by, on*

War-revenue reduction 53.

Wanger, Irving P. (a Representative from Pennsylvania)*Remarks by, on*

Hazing at West Point. 226.

War-Revenue Reduction*Remarks on, by*

Mr. Boreing 252.
Mr. Bromwell 33.
Mr. Gaines 310.
Mr. Maddox 42.
Mr. Norton of Ohio 41.
Mr. Ruppert 43.
Mr. Scudder 331.
Mr. Underwood 53.

West Point Military Academy*Remarks on hazing at, by*

Mr. Adamson 332.
Mr. Clayton of New York 350.
Mr. Wanger 226.

Williams, James R. (a Representative from Illinois)*Remarks by, on*

Army reorganization 8.

Zenor, William T. (a Representative from Indiana)*Remarks by, on*

Oleomargarine 13.

